DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 627 EC 160 479

AUTHOR Horvath, Lester J.; And Others
TITLE Special Education Program Evaluation: A Management Tool.
INSTITUTION Associates in Professional Technologies, Inc., West Hartford, CT.; Massachusetts State Dept. of Education, Boston. Div. of Special Education.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 131p.; For related document, see EC 160 480.
AVAILABLE FROM Massachusetts Department of Education, Division of Special Education, 1385 Hancock St., Quincy, MA 02169 (Publication No. 12356, no price quoted).
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Criteria; Data Collection; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; *Program Evaluation; Surveys; Tests

ABSTRACT

Intended for administrators, the booklet outlines procedures for evaluating district special education programs. An introductory chapter presents the rationale for evaluation as an efficient management tool. A review of the literature addresses five stages in evaluation: (1) defining the evaluation model, (2) collecting evaluation information, (3) analyzing data, (4) writing and presenting reports, and (5) applying evaluation findings. Chapter 3 considers 12 educational goals and program objectives upon which an evaluation can be based. Chapter 4 follows up with evaluation questions derived from specified program objectives. Data collection strategies (surveys, reviews of student folders, and special education enrollment comparisons) are discussed and cross referenced with evaluation questions. Chapter 6 provides the actual evaluation instruments with information on sampling. Data analysis instructions and a format for reporting data are covered in chapter 7. A final chapter offers guidelines for forming recommendations based on evaluation information. Additional readings and evaluation considerations are appended. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED235627

1981 SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION: A MANAGEMENT TOOL

FC160479

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
P. J. McLeese
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Massachusetts Department of Education

SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION
A MANAGEMENT TOOL

DEVELOPED BY: ASSOCIATES IN PROFESSIONAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Box 7-125
West Hartford, Ct. 06107

Lester J. Horvath
Judith Micciulla
Rebecca McGlamery
Dinoo Dastur
Robert K. Gable
Nancy Klein
Wendel Walton

WITH
MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DIVISION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

Program Evaluation Advisory Committee

Edward Bacherman, representative
Massachusetts Association of School Committees
Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Council Chairperson

Henry Clark, representative
Massachusetts Association of 766 Approved Private Schools

Mary Gaynor
Bureau of Program Audit and Assistance

Priscilla Owen McPhee
Inservice Training Coordinator

Judy Riegelhaupt, Division of Special Education
Assistant Associate Commissioner

Dr. Emile Rosenberg, representative
Massachusetts Association of Administrators for Special Education

Geraldine Rowley Ryan
Coordinator, Comprehensive System of Personnel Development

Donald Sommer
Regional Special Education Director, Pittsfield

Beth Strassberg
Regional Liaison, Comprehensive System of Personnel Development, Southeast

MASSACHUSETTS BOARD OF EDUCATION

Anne H. McHugh, Chairperson
James L. Green, Vice-Chairperson
John W. Bond
Millie R. Clements
James P. Doherty
James R. Grande
Howard A. Greis
Charles T. Grigsby
Mary Ann Hardenbergh
Armando Martinez
Edwin M. Rossman
Donald R. Walker

Gregory R. Anrig
Commissioner of Education

Ex Officio Member:
Laura B. Clausen
Chancellor, Board of High Education

DIVISION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

Roger W. Brown
Associate Commissioner

Paulette J. Meleen, Director
Bureau of Program Development and Evaluation

The Massachusetts Department of Education insures equal employment/educational opportunities/affirmative action regardless of race, color, creed, national origin or sex, in compliance with Title IX, or handicap in compliance with Section 504.

Publication #12356, approved by Alfred C. Holland, State Purchasing Agent

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1	INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
CHAPTER 3	GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	25
CHAPTER 4	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	31
CHAPTER 5	DATA COLLECTION STRATEGIES	35
CHAPTER 6	INSTRUMENTATION	39
CHAPTER 7	DATA ANALYSIS AND REPORTING FORMAT	65
CHAPTER 8	FORMULATING REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS	83
APPENDIX A	ADDITIONAL READINGS	91
APPENDIX B	ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS	109

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

School districts in the Commonwealth have expressed the need to evaluate their special education programs in an efficient manner. This handbook is part of a personnel development initiative designed to meet that need.

What Is in This Handbook

The user of this handbook can produce a valid and useful program evaluation report for a school district special education program. This can be done without excessive time and burden because the background work has been done and is included in the following chapters.

Chapter 2 reviews the literature on program evaluation so that the reader will have an understanding of the "how and why" of the activities to follow. Additional readings are provided in Appendix A.

Chapter 3 provides the handbook user with program goals and objectives, thus avoiding the need for extensive research and committee work. Likewise, Chapter 4 saves the user the work of developing evaluation questions from the goals and objectives.

Chapter 5 describes data collection strategies for each evaluation question, keeping in mind both sound evaluation principles and the burdens associated with data collection. Appendix B addresses alternative strategies and additional questions.

In Chapter 6, the actual evaluation instruments are provided, ready for photocopying and use. Instructions are included concerning sampling.

Instructions for data analysis and a reporting format for the handbook instruments are contained in Chapter 7.

In Chapter 8, instructions on formulating report recommendations are provided.

Why Conduct Program Evaluation

Perhaps more important than the mandates to conduct program evaluation is the "common sense" reason behind evaluation. That is: program evaluation is an efficient district management tool. We are in an era of program accountability. School committees, the public, and parents want to know if programs are achieving their intended outcomes. An evaluation report for a program provides such information to policy and budget officials, and to the school personnel operating the program.

Clarification of Terms

A few words about the term "evaluation" should be stated here. In special education, that term is used to describe individual student assessment, and sometimes to describe annual TEAM or Individualized Education Program (IEP) meetings. In this handbook, "program evaluation" refers to a district-wide management tool to measure the extent to which program objectives are being achieved.

The IEP process and program evaluation complement each other. Program evaluation addresses the broad, district-wide goals that we have for all students. The IEP process often leaves these broad goals implicit, unwritten, and unmeasured. With present school technology, it is most difficult to aggregate IEP goal attainment. Thus, program evaluation meets the policy and management-level need for program information.

It is important to note that monitoring activities (e.g., Compliance Review and Program Audit) are related to, but different from, program evaluation. The focus of monitoring is the determination of compliance with laws and regulations. This distinction is addressed in the Chapter 2 Review of Literature.

The term "program" itself must be defined for program evaluation. This handbook uses the prototype as the unit for program analysis. Thus, program evaluation results for a district are discussed by prototype. Of course, other program units may be chosen for analysis (see Appendix B), but prototype analysis is suitable for most school districts.

How Often to Conduct Evaluation

It is suggested that the district conduct formal program evaluation on a three-year cycle. The years between program evaluations can then provide sufficient time to act on the recommendations in the last evaluation report.

Who Should be the Evaluator

Many school districts choose their special education administrator as the program evaluator. External evaluators can be chosen for their impartiality and expertise. In either case, a steering or advisory committee could prove useful to the evaluation process.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Evaluating Special Education Programs

> At the moment, there seems to be no evidence that evaluation, although the law of the land, contributes anything to educational practice other than headaches for the researcher, threats for the innovators, and depressing articles for journals devoted to evaluation (Rippey, 1973:9).

The above quote may very well describe the views of special education program administrators. Such views have led several to ask the following question: does evaluation really make a difference? Today the answer to this evaluation utilization question can be "yes" if the evaluation activities are well designed, systematically implemented and carefully reported to decision makers.

The aim of this chapter of the handbook is to assist in conducting useful program evaluations which are designed to have impact on decision making for program improvement. To achieve this aim, the chapter will first present the concept and objectives of program evaluation. This discussion will be followed by a presentation of five stages of a recommended approach to the evaluation of a special education program.

What is Program Evaluation?

Program evaluation is the process of providing technically adequate, useful, and timely information relevant to decision making. According to Provus:

> The purpose of program evaluation is to determine whether to improve, maintain, or terminate a program. Evaluation is the process of (a) agreeing upon standards, (b) determining whether a discrepancy exists between some aspect of the program and the standards governing that aspect of the program, and (c) using discrepancy information to identify the weaknesses of the program (1969:245).

This definition is consistent with Renzulli's (1975) statement that gathering, analyzing and disseminating information for decision making is always directed toward action by decision makers. Figure 1 depicts the interrelationship between the evaluation process, decision making and action for program improvement.

Consistent with the notion of program evaluation for effective decision making are several objectives of program evaluation forwarded by Renzulli (1975). Implementation of this evaluation handbook should assist special education evaluators in achieving as many of the following objectives as possible:

1. To discover whether, and how effectively, the objectives of a program are being fulfilled.
2. To determine the underlying policies and related activities that contribute to success or failure in particular areas.
3. To provide in-process feedback at intermediate stages throughout the course of a program.
4. To suggest realistic, as well as ideal, alternative courses of action for program modification. (Renzulli, 1975:6).[1]

---

[1]See Renzulli (1975) for an extended discussion of each of these objectives.

FIGURE 1

Relationship Between Evaluation Information, Decision Makers, and Action for Program Improvement (Renzulli: 1975)

To achieve the above it is recommended that the following five stages define the framework for the evaluation activities:

1. Defining the Evaluation Model
2. Collection of Evaluation Information
3. Data Analysis
4. Report Writing and Presentation
5. Application of Evaluation Findings

The remaining sections of this chapter will describe these stages.

EVALUATION STAGES

Stage 1: Defining the Evaluation Model

The first step in the evaluation process is to select an evaluation model. Without such a model the evaluation effort often becomes disjointed and most likely contributes little information to the decision maker.

Program administrators with exposure to the field of program evaluation are well aware that several, often complex, models exist which appear to offer little to the practitioner. The problems experienced with these models have been discussed by Olson (1979) in an excellent article dealing with special education program evaluation. Olson clearly addresss the issue of the variety of terms used by the various models. It appears that one has to learn a new vocabulary to understand each evaluation model. This challenge, along with the often misuse of the terms, leads to much confusion and frustration for program directors attempting to evaluate a program. A major goal of this handbook is to alleviate these problems by presenting a practical and common sense approach which can be easily implemented to efficiently generate information for decision making.

The evaluation model to be described is based mainly on Stufflebeam's

(Stufflebeam, Foley, Gephart, Guba, Hammon, Merriman, & Provus, 1971) CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) model and somewhat on Provus' Discrepancy Evaluation Model (1972). Several of the ideas for the model also came from Olson's (1979) paper on evaluating special education programs.

As stated earlier, the purpose of evaluation is to provide information for decision making. Stufflebeam et al. (1971) state that the functions of these decisions in educational settings can be classified as planning, programming, implementing, and recycling. Planning decisions are those which involve defining the overall scope of the program, and selecting the program goals and objectives. Programming decisions relate to the facilities, personnel, and budget needs of the program. Implementing decisions pertain to the ways in which the program is delivered. Finally, recycling decisions include improving, maintaining or terminating a program.

These four types of education decisions reflect the four components of Stufflebeam's CIPP evaluation model: context, input, process, and product. The context evaluation component relates to the early planning (goal setting) stage of the project. Input evaluation follows immediately as program services and resources are examined. Process evaluation would take place throughout the program to monitor how the services are delivered. Finally, product evaluation would examine the outcomes of the program for all target groups at the end of the program cycle. Figure 2 presents the four components of Stufflebeam's CIPP model along with a description of the objective of the component, the evaluation method employed, and the relationship of each to the program decision to be made. Each of these four components of program evaluation will now be presented in the realm of special education programs.

FIGURE 2

Stufflebeam's Four Types of Evaluation (From Stufflebeam, D.L.) The Use and Abuse of Evaluation in Title III. Theory Into Practice, June, 1967, 6 31, (126-133).

	CONTEXT EVALUATION	INPUT EVALUATION	PROCESS EVALUATION	PRODUCT EVALUATION
OBJECTIVE	To define the *operating context*, to identify and assess needs and *opportunities* in the context, and to diagnose *problems* underlying the *needs* and opportunities.	To identify and assess *system capabilities*, available input *strategies*, and designs for implementing the strategies.	To identify or predict, in process, *defects* in the procedural design or its implementation, to provide information for the preprogrammed decisions, and to maintain a record of *procedural events* and activities.	To relate outcome *information* to objectives and to context, input, and process information.
METHOD	By describing the context, by comparing actual and intended inputs and outputs, by comparing probable and possible system performance, and analyzing possible causes of discrepancies between actualities and intentions.	By describing and analyzing available human and material resources, solution strategies, and procedural designs for relevance, feasibility and economy in the course of action to be taken.	By monitoring the activity's potential procedural barriers and remaining alert to unanticipated ones, by obtaining specified information for programmed decisions, and describing the actual process.	By defining operationally and measuring criteria associated with the objectives, by comparing these measurements with predetermined standards or comparative bases, and by interpreting the outcomes in terms of recorded context, input and process information.
RELATION TO DECISION MAKING IN THE CHANGE	For deciding upon the *setting* to be served, the *goals* associated with meeting needs or using opportunities, and the *objectives* associated with solving problems, i.e., for *planning* needed changes.	For selecting *sources of support*, solution *strategies*, and procedural designs, i.e., for *structuring* change activities.	For *implementing* and *defining the program design and procedure*, i.e., for effecting process control.	For deciding to *continue, terminate, modify*, or *refocus* a change activity, and for linking the activity to other major phases of the change process, i.e., for recycling change activities.

Context Evaluation. Context evaluation is concerned with identifying the environment in which the program will be delivered, the unmet needs of the target group, and the obstacles for meeting these needs. The appropriate evaluation questions are: (1) What are the unmet needs of the target group? (2) What program obstacles or constraints exist that impede meeting these needs? and (3) What program goals and objectives are necessary to meet these needs? To answer these questions, information is gathered pertaining to the identification of unmet student needs (e.g., achievement, emotional, and behavior) as well as possible obstacles such as a lack of staff or inadequate budget levels which impede meeting these needs. Once this has been accomplished, the program goals and objectives intended to overcome these unmet needs can be developed. One purpose of this handbook is to facilitate this task by presenting possible goals, objectives, and evaluation questions. These context concerns have been identified for the user of this handbook, in an effort to reduce the burden of conducting the program evaluation.

Project-developed or selected program goals are deemed applicable or valid if they have resulted from some form of needs assessment process, represent statewide or local goals for education, or are derived from special education regulations. In this evaluation handbook the statewide goals for education are considered along with process goals derived from mandates in special education. Using these sources, the goals for special education programs were developed and will be presented in Chapter 3 of the handbook. The task for the evaluator has been simplified as applicable goals have been selected for the school district. The task of identifying and

clarifying alternate goals need not be undertaken unless it is deemed necessary.[1]

In selecting appropriate goals the evaluator should note that each goal is rather broad in scope, is a general statement of program aspirations, and reflects a long-term aim of the program (California State Department of Education, 1979). The purpose of the goals is to set the framework for the evaluation process as they represent the basis for the goal attainment evaluation model to be recommended in this handbook.

In contrast to the somewhat abstract nature of program goals are the more specific program objectives which become an extremely important part of any program evaluation (Worthen and Sanders, 1973). Program objectives should be statements describing program results with a criterion of success. That is, they should indicate what will be different as a result of the special education program. Thus, objectives need to be written in clear, unambiguous terms so that they can be measured (Patton, 1978). In selecting applicable objectives for the evaluation, note that each objective is not merely a program activity such as might be specified in a special education regulation. This is an important distinction. Rossi, Freeman, and Wright (1979) have noted that several federal programs have failed as the program "activities" became the program "objectives." A properly stated objective defines one intent of the program, specifies a program outcome in measurable terms, and can be accomplished within a specified time frame (Rossi, Freeman, and Wright 1979; California State Department of Education, 1979).

While the distinction between goals and objectives is indeed a

---

[1]For those wishing to identify new goals or clarify existing goals, there are several strategies available which are referenced in Appendix B.

relative one, objectives clearly narrow the intent of the program goals and focus the evaluation questions which take the form: "To what extent is the program succeeding in reaching its goals?" (Weiss, 1972: 24-26). In selecting the goals and objectives provided in the handbook, the evaluation questions can also be identified. These questions provide the basis for quantifying the extent to which program objectives have been met. Once the evaluation setting, the program goals, objectives and evaluation questions have been established, the resources available for delivering the program should be described.

Input Evaluation. The evaluation of program input is aimed at determining how the program can utilize its resources to meet the program goals. The essential evaluation questions are: (1) Does the special education program have the necessary prerequisite resources to deliver the needed services? (2) What strategies will be employed to meet the program goals? and (3) How will these strategies be implemented? (MacMillan and Semmel, 1977). Particular emphasis is placed upon identifying and assessing the program's capabilities in the areas of program budget, facilities, staff requirements, scheduling, and material resources. Provus (1972) has listed several areas to be assessed in an input evaluation. An adaptation of these areas for special education by Olson (1979) resulted in the following list:

1. Staff qualifications
2. Staff pre-program training
3. Student selection criteria
4. Student entry characteristics
5. Media facilities
6. School system facilities
7. Administrative support

Note that the input evaluation is quite similar to the accreditation review process, where the site visit team examines program documents in relation to laws and regulations specified at state or federal levels (Olson, 1979; Stake, 1967). Given adequate program resources, the program is then initiated and the evaluation focus turns to the delivery of the program.

Process Evaluation. The evaluation of program process pertains to a continuous examination of the manner in which the program has been delivered in relation to program design. The key evaluation question is: To what extent has the program implemented the activities which were designed to meet the program goals? Thus, a primary aspect of the evaluation activity is the ongoing identification of problems with program design or implementation. A secondary, but essential, aspect of process evaluation is the description of all project activities. This is necessary in a retrospective sense as the information can be used to explain success or failure in meeting the project goals during the product evaluation stage. Only with information regarding possible variations between what program activities were planned and delivered can the evaluator realistically explain the outcome data at the end of the project.

Provus (1972) suggests that the key areas for examination are student and staff activities (with respect to functions and duties) and program activities. Stufflebeam et al. (1971) clarify these comments by listing the following potential areas to be examined:

1. Interpersonal relationships between staff and students
2. Communication channels
3. Program logistics
4. Perceptions of program intent by those involved or affected by the program
5. Adequacy of program resources, staff, facilities and time schedules during the program

In the field of special education, process evaluation is similar to program audit or compliance review monitoring where program implementation or operation is assessed in relation to program standards (Rossi, Freeman, and Wright, 1979). An important difference between process evaluation and compliance monitoring is that process evaluation is able to address the quality aspect of programs and services aside from procedural requirements. During the monitoring activity state and federal laws and regulations provide the standards used by the site visit team. During this stage of the evaluation of special education programs, applicable areas to be addressed could be as follows:

1. Student identification procedures
2. Student referral procedures
3. Student assessment and evaluation procedures
4. Individualized Education Program (IEP) planning
5. Instruction and provision of services

Once the program has been delivered, it is necessary to examine the impact of the program on all target areas.

Product Evaluation. The final component of Stufflebeam's CIPP evaluation model is product evaluation. The aim of this part of the evaluation is to determine the effectiveness of the program at the end of a particular

program time period. The two primary evaluation questions asked are: (1) to what extent have the program goals been accomplished, and (2) how confident can we be that the observed changes are a result of the educational program? In addressing the first question, the objectives agreed upon during the context stage of the evaluation are measured against program standards. Thus, product evaluation employs Provus' discrepancy evaluation concept which involves a comparison of actual program outcomes with desired outcomes or goals (Patton, 1978; Provus, 1971). The second question above is addressed through the matching of program outcomes to actual program processes. That is, information gathered during the context, input, and especially the process evaluation components is related to product (Stufflebeam et al. 1971). This product information is essential as it provides the basis for decisions regarding program modification.

Olson points out that writers often employ synonymous terms such as output, outcome, effect and impact when discussing product evaluation and offers the following definition for a product evaluation:

> Changes in persons or organizations which can be measured or described in terms of quantity, quality, or duration which are attributable to a program. Such changes may occur relative to the student, relative to the satisfaction of persons with the program, or relative to organization of the program (Olson, 1979: 8).

This definition of product evaluation is consistent with the Stufflebeam et al. (1971) CIPP model, as well as the work of Provus (1971) and Stake (1967). Stake (1967) further clarifies the components of a product evaluation by noting that areas to be examined are student activities, achievements, attitudes, and aspirations, as well as the impact of the program on teachers, administrators, and parents.

For the evaluation of a special education program, Olson (1979) has suggested several specific areas to be examined. An adaptation of these areas is as follows:

1. Student Development (IEP Results) in the Areas of:
    a. Achievement (competency) test results (basic skills and general knowledge)
    b. High school credit and graduation
    c. Self-sufficiency
    d. Self-worth
    e. Social behavior
    f. General life skills
    g. Attendance rates
2. Student Perceptions of, and Interactions with:
    a. Family
    b. School staff
    c. Peers
3. Satisfaction with Program by:
    a. Students
    b. Teachers
    c. Administrators
    d. Parents

A Caution. This discussion of the components of a product or outcome evaluation needs to be followed by a caution to the evaluator. The basis of the caution lies in the enormous emphasis placed by many evaluators on an "outcomes only" evaluation.

As Provus (1971) has noted, several evaluators have a preoccupation with conducting a microanalysis of student achievement or perception before

or after exposure to a particular program. The problem with such limited-focus evaluations is that they fail to provide the essential information necessary to make valid program decisions, as no comprehensive information is available regarding the way in which the program was developed or implemented; i.e., the input and process components of the evaluation received little attention. Patton (1978) and Weiss (1972) call this the "black-box" approach to evaluation. To unlock the "black box" the evaluation must also place emphasis on program implementation or the process component. This is essential since most writers agree that failure at the program implementation stage often accounts for the lack of desired program outcomes.

In summary, we have reviewed the four components of Stufflebeam's CIPP evaluation model in the context of evaluating special education programs. For ease of reference, Figure 3 presents a summary of the evaluation components, questions and areas that have been identitifed in this section. In employing this evaluation model, program evaluators should be able to quite readily implement the context and input components. It is suggested that much emphasis be placed upon gathering information during the process (program implementation) component so that the program outcomes obtained in the product component will lead to rational program decisions based upon actual program operation.

Stage 2: Collection of Evaluation Information

After the four components of the evaluation model have been defined, the various sources of information should be identified. Once this has been accomplished the instruments and methods for obtaining the information can be selected.

A feature of this handbook is that available data sources have been

Figure 3: Summary of Special Education Program Evaluation Components, Questions, and Areas

Evaluation Components	Context	Input	Process	Product
Evaluation Questions	1. What are the unmet needs of the target group? 2. What program obstacles or constraints exist that impede meeting these needs? 3. What program goals and objectives are necessary to meet these needs?	1. Does the program have the necessary pre-requisite resources to deliver the needed services? 2. What strategies will be employed to meet the program goals? 3. How will these strategies be implemented?	1. To what extent has the program implemented the activities which were designed to meet the program goals?	1. To what extent have the program goals been accomplished? 2. How confident can we be that the observed changes are a result of the educational program?
Evaluation Areas	1. Student needs 2. School environment 3. Program goals 4. Program objectives	1. Staff qualifications 2. Staff pre-program training 3. Student selection criteria 4. Student entry characteristics 5. Media facilities 6. School system facilities 7. Administrative support	1. Interpersonal relationships between staff and students 2. Communication channels 3. Program logistics 4. Perceptions of program intent by those involved or affected by the program 5. Adequacy of program resources, staff, facilities and time schedules during the program 6. Student identification procedures 7. Student referral procedures 8. Student assessment and evaluation procedures 9. Eligibility requirements 10. Individual Program Planning (IEP) 11. Instructions and provision of services	1. Student development (IEP results) a. Achievement (competency) test results (basic skills and general knowledge) b. high school credit and graduation c. self-sufficiency d. self-worth e. social behavior f. general life skills g. attendance rates 2. Student perceptions of, and interactions with: a. family b. school staff c. regular students 3. Satisfaction with program by: a. students b. teachers c. administrators d. parents

described and applicable instruments are identified and/or included in Chapters 5 and 6. The user will be provided with the necessary six data collection instruments.

To obtain the necessary information, sampling procedures may be desirable in some situations. It is expected, though, that for most research questions all program prototypes will be included in the evaluation. For those cases where sampling may be appropriate, a section on sampling considerations will be presented in Chapter 6.

The final step in the Collection of Evaluation Information stage is the specification of conditions and time schedules for gathering the information. These procedures need to be established by the program evaluator in light of state and federal regulations as well as local schedules.

Stage 3: Data Analysis

Once the information has been collected, the data analysis can be carried out. The procedures specified in the handbook will only require descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, and means. In those cases where educators wish to make statistical comparisons for student growth from year to year, the related t-test would be appropriate and can be calculated with a hand calculator or a computer. In all cases, the selection of data analysis techniques should be based upon the need for a simple statistical approach for the evaluation question.

Stage 4: Report Writing and Presentation

The best evaluation information can be quite meaningless if it is not reported in a manner which is both timely and applicable to the intended audience. Thus, the evaluator must first specify the timelines and audiences for the report. Possible audiences may include school committees, teachers,

program directors, superintendents, state or federal departments, newspapers, and parents.

Once the audience is known, the information needs of the group for potential decision making should be specified. In far too many cases evaluations are not used due to either a lack of or too much information, or information that is not properly focused upon the major evaluation questions.

Finally, it is necessary for the evaluator to be brief, but creative, in the presentation. In all cases a variety of methods should be considered for presenting the evaluation information (e.g., graphic displays, descriptive reports, narratives, technical reports, executive summaries, and verbal reports). The selection of one or several methods should be based upon the information processing capabilities of the target audience.

Stage 5: Application of Evaluation Findings

The final phase in the evaluation process is the "action" stage referred to earlier in this section. If the evaluation is conducted at an intermediate stage of the program, the action may take the form of a formative evaluation decision. According to Scriven (1967), the term "formative" implies that the program is ongoing and that the evaluation has been carried out to discover deficiencies and successes in the intermediate stages of the program. The purpose is then to provide continuous feedback to the program so that appropriate modifications can be instituted. These types of formative evaluation decisions are most appropriate for the evaluation of ongoing special education programs.

So that the distinction will be clear, we should note that decisions made at the end of a program regarding overall program effectiveness are based upon a summative evaluation. These decisions pertain to overall

program continuation or adoption decisions.

In practice, most program evaluations employ both the formative and summative evaluation techniques. The key distinction for the evaluator during the context, input, process, and product evaluation components is the role the information gathered will play in the decision making process. This is why Stufflebeam continually emphasizes the need for evaluators to specify the types of decisions to be made during each stage of the program evaluation.

References

California State Department of Education. Program Evaluator's Guide. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1979.

MacMillan, D. L., & Semmel, M. I. Evaluation of mainstreaming programs. Focus on Exceptional Children, September, 1977, 9, No. 4.

Olson, K. R. Evaluating effectiveness of special education programs. Mid-South Bulletin No. 10. Lexington, Kentucky: Coordinating Center for Regional Resource Centers, 1979.

Patton, M. Q. Utilization-Focused Evaluation. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1978.

Provus, M. Evaluation of ongoing programs in the public school systems. In R. W. Tyler (Ed.), Educational Evaluation: New Roles, New Means. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Provus, M. Discrepancy Evaluation. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1972.

Renzulli, J. R. A Guidebook for Evaluating Programs for the Gifted and Talented. Los Angeles: National/State Leadership Training Institute on the Gifted and Talented, 1975.

Rossi, P. H., Freeman, H. E., & Wright, S. R. Evaluation--A Systematic Approach. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1979.

Rippey, R. M. The nature of transactional evaluation. In R. M. Rippey (Ed.), Studies in Transactional Evaluation. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1973.

Scriven, M. The methodology of evaluation. In R. W. Tyler, R. M. Gagne, & M. Scriven (Eds.), Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation. AERA Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation, No. 1, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967.

Stake, R. E. The countenance of educational evaluation. Teacher's College Record, 1967, 68, 523-540.

Stufflebeam, D. L. The use and abuse of evaluation in Title III. Theory Into Practice, June 1967, 6, (3), 126-133.

Stufflebeam, D. L., Foley, W. J., Gephart, W. J., Guba, E. G., Hammond, R. L., Merriman, H. O., & Provus, M. Educational Evaluation and Decision Making in Education. Itasca, Il.: Peacock, 1971.

Weiss, C. H. Evaluation Research: Methods of Assessing Program Effectiveness. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Worthen, B. R., & Sanders, J. S. (Eds.) Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones, 1973.

CHAPTER 3

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

A key aspect of this handbook is that most of the preparation for conducting a program evaluation has been completed for the user.

In this chapter, certain educational goals and program objectives are stated in the proper fashion. The twelve goals (and commensurate objectives) were derived from State Board of Education goals and key aspects of Massachusetts Special Education law.

Persons choosing to conduct an evaluation based upon additional goals should refer to Appendix B for instructions. It should be noted that the larger the set of education goals, the more burden involved in conducting a program evaluation which measures the implementation of those goals. The goals (and objectives) put forth in this chapter were chosen as a sound balance between the burden or effort associated with program evaluation and the exhaustive approach advocated by some evaluators. These goals were refined and approved by the Special Education Program Evaluation Advisory Committee. Both <u>product</u> goals and <u>process</u> goals are included in this handbook. As described elsewhere, product goals specify student outcomes or progress. Process goals are complementary in that they specify certain qualitative aspects related to the instructional program.

It could be said that these goals represent the "intent" of schools and of special education laws with respect to the education of children with special needs.

Educational Goals

Product goals: These goals are derived from State Board of Education Goals and are concerned with student progress and student achievement.

1. PHYSICAL AND EMOTIONAL WELL-BEING; VALUES AND ATTITUDES

   Education should contribute to the learners' physical and emotional well-being, and cultivate the values and attitudes of all learners.

2. SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE

   Education should develop in each learner the capacity and desire for the effective use of knowledge and skills such as reading, writing, speaking, and computation.

3. CITIZENSHIP AND RESPECT

   Education should provide each learner with experiences contributing to an understanding and respect for our democratic society and the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

4. OCCUPATIONAL COMPETENCE

   Education should provide the learner with occupational skills, experience and attitudes that will be needed for initial and future job opportunities.

5. ENVIRONMENT

   Education should provide each learner with knowledge and attitudes concerning intelligent use of the environment.

6. CREATIVE INTERESTS AND TALENTS

   Education should provide each learner with opportunities to develop and express creative interests and talents.

Process goals: These process goals are derived from Chapter 766 Special Education Regulations and State Department of Education monitoring materials.

7. CHILD IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION

   Identification and evaluation procedures should ensure that special education programs are serving the intended recipients and facilitate sound educational planning for students.

8. PARENT AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

   The school should encourage a working partnership involving parents and the public in school decisions.

9. FACILITIES AND RANGE OF SERVICES

   School facilities and the range of services offered to special education students should be of high quality and meet the unique needs of handicapped children.

10. STAFF DEVELOPMENT

    Staff development activities should improve the skills and attitudes of school personnel serving children with special needs.

11. LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT

    TEAMS should make decisions which meet the intent of "Least Restrictive Environment" provisions in the law.

12. IEP EVALUATION

    The school district should use a system for determining which programs are successful and which programs are unsuccessful in meeting the needs of handicapped children, and redesign classroom programs when IEP goals are not being met.

Objectives

1. The student's education program will:
   - 1.1 provide physical education which benefits the child
   - 1.2 enhance the self-concept of students
   - 1.3 cultivate values and attitudes

2. The student's education program will develop:
   - 2.1 basic skills in language arts
   - 2.2 basic skills in mathematics
   - 2.3 student's desire to learn

3. The student's education program will:
   - 3.1 encourage an understanding of our democratic society
   - 3.2 foster the commitment to the rights and responsibilities of citizenship

4. The student's education program will:
   - 4.1 provide job skills, experiences and work attitudes necessary for initial job placement
   - 4.2 provide skills and attitudes necessary for adapting to changing job situations

5. The student's education program will:
   - 5.1 develop attitudes and behaviors which lead to intelligent use of the environment

6. The student's education program will:
   - 6.1 develop the creative expression of interests and talents

7. The student's education program will:

   7.1 serve the intended recipients

   7.2 facilitate sound educational planning for individual students

8. The student's education program will:

   8.1 encourage a working partnership between parents and the school concerning school decisions

   8.2 encourage a working partnership between the general public and the school concerning school decisions

9. The student's education program will:

   9.1 use school facilities of high quality

   9.2 offer a range of services of high quality

   9.3 provide facilities and services which meet unique student needs

10. The student's education program will:

   10.1 conduct inservice training which meets staff skill needs

   10.2 conduct inservice training which improves staff attitudes

11. The student's education program will:

   11.1 make decisions through TEAMS which meet the intent of least restrictive environment provisions in law

12. The student's education program will:

12.1 systematically determine which programs are successful and unsuccessful in helping students achieve goals set forth in their IEPs

12.2 redesign individual classroom programs when deemed unsuccessful due to the program design

12.3 write individualized education program goals in a manner which allows the TEAM to judge program success

CHAPTER 4

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation questions in this chapter are derived from the program objectives specified in Chapter 3. These questions are posed for the user of this handbook to minimize the work required in conducting a proper program evaluation. As discussed in Chapter 2, evaluation questions serve the key purpose of focusing the evaluation activities directly toward program goals and objectives; that is, these questions are a link between program goals and items in the data collection instruments.

Criteria

Before collecting evaluation data, the evaluator should set criteria for the successful attainment of each program objective. This can be done as part of each evaluation question, or an overall program criteria can be established as applicable to all of the program objectives.

Four criteria choices are offered to the evaluator, with as much of the background work completed as possible. One of the following alternatives should be chosen:

1. 100% criteria - each program objective will be fully met for the students in each special education prototype.

2. 90% criteria - each program objective will be successfully met for 90% of the students in each special education prototype.

3. 70% criteria - each program objective will be successully met for 70% of the students in each special education prototype.

4. longitudinal criteria - each program objective will be met to the extent measured in the previous program evaluation,

and certain objectives will show improvement in attainment as compared to the previous program evaluation. The objectives selected for improvement were cited as such in the recommendation section of the previous program evaluation report. (The first program evaluation using longitudinal criteria yields a baseline of descriptive information for future comparisons).

It is recommended that the user choose the longitudinal criteria approach unless there is reason to believe that some specific criteria should be attained. It is recognized that this approach is a departure from traditional special education thinking. In compliance monitoring, for example, the regulations impose the 100% criteria standard on all procedural requirements (e.g., all children must have IEPs). It would be most unrealistic to expect 100% attainment of program outcomes in program evaluation such as this since variables outside the control of the school district affect attainment of these program objectives.

The Evaluation Questions

The following list of evaluation questions numerically corresponds to the program goals and objectives used in this handbook.

1.1 Are students benefiting from regular physical education and special physical education?

1.2 Do students exhibit positive self-concepts?

1.3 Do students develop positive values and attitudes?

2.1 Do students achieve a level of language art skills commensurate with their ability?

2.2 Do students achieve a level of mathematical skills commensurate with their ability?

2.3 Do students exhibit a desire to learn?

3.1 Have students been provided an understanding of our democratic society?

3.2 Have students developed a commitment to citizenship rights and responsibilities?

4.1 Are students prepared to obtain their initial job?

4.2 Do students possess skills and attitudes necessary to obtain employment in a changing job market?

5.1 Have students developed attitudes and behaviors which lead to intelligent use of the environment?

6.1 Have students developed creative interests and talents?

7.1 Are special education programs serving the intended recipients?

7.2 Do special education child evaluation activities facilitate sound educational planning for individual students?

8.1 Do special education programs encourage a working partnership between parents and the school concerning school decisions?

8.2 Do special education programs encourage a working partnership between the general public and the school concerning school decisions?

9.1 Do special education programs use school facilities of high quality?

9.2 Do special education programs offer a range of services of high quality?

9.3 Do special education programs provide facilities and services which meet unique student needs?

10.1 Does the special education program provide inservice training which meets staff skill needs?

10.2 Does the special education program provide inservice training which improves staff attitudes?

11.1 Do special education TEAMS make decisions which meet the intent of least restrictive environment provisions in law?

12.1 Are the individual classroom programs which are unsuccessful in helping children achieve IEP goals identified in a systematic fashion?

12.2 Are unsuccessful classroom programs redesigned?

12.3 Are IEP goals written in a manner which allows the TEAM to judge program success?

CHAPTER 5

DATA COLLECTION STRATEGIES

An evaluator has many choices when selecting data collection strategies to answer evaluation questions. In this handbook, the work is done for the user, with an effort toward maximum validity and minimum data collection burden.

A few words about the balance between validity and response burden are in order. If validity were the only concern, dozens of different sources of data would be employed in the evaluation. For example, the evaluator might collect survey information from all of the people related, in any fashion, to the program and augment the survey data with extensive program observation, records review, and rating scales. As each source of information is considered, the evaluator could be more sure of the level of attainment of each program objective.

In order to produce an evaluation report before one's retirement, one must face the fact that every possible source of data cannot be tapped. More seriously, the evaluator is most likely a special education administrator who is already burdened with the operation of a most complex program.

The data collection strategies in this handbook are designed to be employed by a working administrator who is charged with program evaluation as an additional duty. The level of information yielded from these data collection strategies should enable the evaluator to make useful and valid statements about the attainment of program objectives.

The following list of data collection strategies (instruments) is used in this handbook:

A. Student Survey

B. Parent Survey

C. Special Education Teacher Survey and
Regular Education Teacher Survey

D. Student Folder Review

E. Related Services Staff Survey

F. Special Education Enrollment Comparison

The following index of evaluation questions and corresponding data collection strategies is provided as a reference:

DATA COLLECTION STRATEGIES (INSTRUMENTS)

EVALUATION QUESTIONS	DATA COLLECTION STRATEGIES
1.1 Physical Education	Student Survey Parent Survey
1.2 Self-Concept	Student Survey Parent Survey Teacher Survey
1.3 Values & Attitudes	Student Survey Parent Survey Teacher Survey
2.1 Language Arts	Parent Survey Student Folder Review
2.2 Mathematics	Parent Survey Student Folder Review
2.3 Desire to Learn	Student Survey Parent Survey Teacher Survey
3.1 Democratic Society	Parent Survey Teacher Survey
3.2 Citizenship	Parent Survey Teacher Survey
4.1 Initial Job	Related Services Staff Survey

4.2	Job Market	Related Services Staff Survey
5.1	Environment	Parent Survey Teacher Survey Related Services Staff Survey
6.1	Creativity	Parent Survey Teacher Survey
7.1	Intended Recipients	Special Education Enrollment Comparison
7.2	Student Evaluations/ Planning	Teacher Survey Related Services Staff Survey
8.1	Parental Participation	Parent Survey Related Services Staff Survey
8.2	Public Participation	Parent Survey Related Services Staff Survey
9.1	Quality Facilities	Teacher Survey Related Services Staff Survey
9.2	Quality Services	Teacher Survey Related Services Staff Survey
9.3	Individualized Facilities/ Services	Teacher Survey Related Services Staff Survey
10.1	Inservice/Skills	Teacher Survey Related Services Staff Survey
10.2	Inservice/Attitudes	Teacher Survey Related Services Staff Survey
11.1	LRE Intent	Special Education Enrollment Comparison
12.1	Identify Unsuccessful Programs	Teacher Survey Related Services Staff Survey
12.2	Redesign Unsuccessful Programs	Teacher Survey Related Services Staff Survey
12.3	IEP Evaluability	Parent Survey Teacher Survey Related Services Staff Survey Student Folder Review

CROSS-REFERENCE OF EVALUATION QUESTIONS
AND DATA COLLECTION STRATEGIES

INSTRUMENTS	QUESTIONS ANSWERED
A - Student Survey	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.3
B - Parent Survey	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 5.1, 6.1, 8.1, 8.2, 12.3
C - Teacher Survey	1.2, 1.3, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 5.1, 6.1, 7.2, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 10.1, 10.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3
D - Student Folder Review	2.1, 2.2, 12.3
E - Related Services Staff Survey	4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 7.2, 8.1, 8.2, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 10.1, 10.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3
F - Special Education Enrollment Comparison	7.1, 11.1

CHAPTER 6

INSTRUMENTATION

The instruments provided in this chapter are designed to answer the evaluation questions posed in Chapter 4 of the handbook. The user of these instruments should take the following two steps:

1. Determine the proper sample
2. Produce, distribute, and collect the instruments

Step 1: Determining the Proper Sample

The following pages will help you determine the sample for each instrument. There are two areas of consideration in the sampling process. The first area represents the number of students/parents to be chosen for the sample. The second area represents the number of staff (e.g., regular education, special education, and related services) to be included in the samples. The following sections will provide instructions for selecting these samples.

Student/Parent Selection. This section will describe how to choose the proper number of students/parents in the sample for each prototype. When these students are chosen, the following three instruments will be employed in the evaluation for the chosen sample:

- Student survey (instrument A)
- Parent survey (instrument B)
- Student Folder Review (instrument D)

Student Survey Sample Size. First, the evaluator must choose a minimum sample size. The following table was designed with response burden in mind:

Total number of Chapter 766 students in the District	Minimum number of Chapter 766 students to be chosen for the sample
Less than 500	60
500 - 999	100
1000 - 2999	140
over 3000	180

Once the minimum needed sample size has been determined, you are ready to select the number of students for each prototype. That is, the minimum district sample size will be "broken out" to determine the sample size for each prototype. To achieve this, consider the sample district example which follows:

This sample district has 300 Chapter 766 students. Based upon the suggested table for sample size, a minimum of 60 students should be included in the evaluation. At the same time, you should attempt to include at least six students for each prototype. To achieve a sample proportionate to the number in each prototype, the following steps should be followed:

1. List the actual number of students in each prototype (column 1)

2. Divide the actual number in each prototype by the total number of students in the district to obtain the respective proportions in each prototype (column 2). Using prototype 502.1; 24 ÷ 300 = .08

3. Multiply each proportion (column 2) times the minimum needed sample size to obtain the approximate number in each prototype (column 3). Using prototype 502.1 as an example, .08 x 60 = 5.

4. Where possible, it is a good rule to include at least six students in each prototype sample. In column 4, enter the "Final" sample size for each prototype, following the above rule. In the example presented, the final prototype sample size is now 77 students. This increase from the tentative sample size (62) resulted from following the rule of including at least six students from each prototype where possible.

SAMPLE DISTRICT

Prototypes	Actual Number in Prototype	Proportion in Prototype	Tentative* Prototype Sample Size	Final Prototype Sample Sizes
	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
502.1	24	.08	5	6**
502.2	180	.60	36	36
502.3	30	.10	6	6
502.4	39	.13	8	8
502.4(i)	0	.00	0	0
502.5	9	.03	2	6**
502.6	9	.03	2	6**
502.7	3	.01	1	3***
502.8(a)	3	.01	1	3***
502.8(b)	0	.00	0	0
502.8(c)	0	.00	0	0
502.9	3	.01	1	3***
502.11(a)	0	.00	0	0
502.11(b)	0	.00	0	0

District Total = 300 Minimum Sample Size = 62

Final Sample Size = 77

*In some cases, it may be necessary to "round off" your calculations to whole numbers.

**Increased to a sample of 6 because of the rule of including at least 6 students from each prototype.

***Sample sizes increased to the total number in the prototype since there are fewer than 6 available.

Use the table below to determine sample sizes for your district (use columns 1-4). The sampling index (column 5) will be discussed in the paragraph below.

Prototypes	Actual Number in Prototype	Proportion in Prototype	Tentative Prototype Sample Size	Final Prototype Sample Sizes	Sampling "Index"
	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5
502.1					
502.2					
502.3					
502.4					
502.4(i)					
502.5					
502.6					
502.7					
502.8(a)					
502.8(b)					
502.8(c)					
502.9					
502.11(a)					
502.11(b)					
TOTALS					

After determining final prototype sample sizes, you need to select the actual students. A good procedure is to divide the actual number of students in each prototype (column 1) by the final prototype sample size (column 4) to obtain the sampling "index" to select the names of students. For example, if you obtain a sampling "index" of 4 for prototype 502.1, select every fourth student from your roster of 502.1 students.

Parent Survey Sample Size. The selection of the student sample has, at the same time identified the parent sample to be given the parent survey.

Staff Sample Selection

Special Education Teachers.* Districts with fewer than 50 special education staff members should administer the surveys to all such staff. Larger districts should choose a random sample of 50 special education staff. A simple procedure for this would be to divide the number of staff by 50 to obtain the sampling "index." With an alphabetic roster, the sampling "index" is then used to select the sample. For example, if there are 200 special education teachers, the index would be 200/50 or 4. Every fourth person on the roster would be chosen.

Regular Education Teachers.* Using the above procedures and a roster of all regular education teachers in the district, choose a "random" sample of 50 regular education staff.

Related Services Staff.* Administer the related services staff survey to all such staff.

Step 2: Producing, Distributing, and Collecting Instruments

Now that you have chosen the people who will respond to your instruments, you will need to actually collect the data. It may very well be that your district already has established procedures for the production, distribution, and collection of survey forms. If not, the following are some thoughts for your consideration.

The primary concern should be the development of a systematic method for the distribution and collection of the instruments. Your common sense and knowledge of your district should be your guide. It is essential, though, that you follow up both incomplete responses and unreturned instruments.

*Note: it is suggested that districts do not survey any non-district staff.

THE INSTRUMENTS

The following pages contain the instruments you will photocopy and use in the evaluation. A list of these instruments is provided here:

A - STUDENT SURVEY

B - PARENT SURVEY

C - SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER SURVEY AND
REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER SURVEY

D - STUDENT FOLDER REVIEW

E - RELATED SERVICES STAFF SURVEY

F - SPECIAL EDUCATION ENROLLMENT COMPARISON

NOTE:

1. districts may choose to delete staff, parent and student names from the instruments.

2. alternative data analysis techniques are discussed in Chapter 7. It is essential that identifiable variables (e.g., school site) be included on the instruments if such alternatives are desired.

3. it is suggested that dates and "return" information be typed in prior to reproduction of the instruments.

THE PROTOTYPES

502.1	Regular education with program modification
502.2	Regular education with no more than 25% time out
502.3	Regular education with no more than 60% time out
502.4	Substantially separate program
502.4 (i)	Substantially separate program other than public school regular education facility
502.5	Day school program
502.6	Residential school program
502.7	Home or hospital programs
502.8 (a)	Home-based programs (3-4 year olds)
502.8 (b)	Integrated center-based programs (3-4 year olds)
502.8 (c)	Separate center-based programs (3-4 year olds)
502.9	Diagnostic program
502.11(a)	Programs for 16 through 21 year olds in other prototypes
502.11(b)	TEAM-designed special programs (16-21 year olds)

EXAMPLE MEMORANDUM TO STAFF AND PARENTS
PROVIDING NOTICE OF PROGRAM EVALUATION

Districts may choose to provide a public-information type notice to parents and staff concerning the special education program evaluations. Such notice may help prevent misunderstandings about the purposes of the evaluation.

The school newsletter or individual mailings may be used to disseminate this notice. An example notice follows:

NOTICE

Every three years, our district evaluates the Chapter 766 special education program to improve its effectiveness. We will be sending survey instruments to a "random sample" of staff and parents as part of this effort. If you are asked to contribute information, please give this matter your most careful attention. Questions concerning this program evaluation should be directed to: _____.

SAMPLE LETTER TO SERVICE PROVIDERS FOR CHILDREN PLACED OUT OF DISTRICT

NOTE TO THE EVALUATOR: For instrument A, be sure to include students served out of the district when such students were chosen by the sampling process. The following example transmittal letter is provided for your convenience.

TO:

FROM:

SUBJECT: Enclosed student survey forms

DATE:

We are conducting a special education program evaluation for our school district. One aspect of this is the student survey. Please see that the enclosed form(s) are given to the appropriate staff so that the students can be supervised as they fill them out.

We request that you send the completed material back as soon as possible. In order to keep within our schedule, receipt of this material within one week would be most appreciated.

Completed student surveys should be sent to:

Thank you.

Instrument A
Student Survey

For School Use

Student Name
Date Prototype

Instruction to Teacher: Certain selected student(s) assigned to you are asked to respond to the questions in this survey. Please help them fill out this survey completely and make every effort not to influence their responses. Individual responses will be kept confidential and used only for program evaluation.

Return the completed form(s) to_____by_____.

Instruction to Student: Answer each question with an "x."

		true	not true	don't know doesn't apply
A.1	Gym helps me stay in shape and keep fit. (1.1)	____	____	____
A.2	I am easy to like. (1.2)	____	____	____
A.3	I like being the way I am. (1.2)	____	____	____
A.4	I am a good person. (1.2)	____	____	____
A.5	School work is fairly easy for me. (2.3)	____	____	____
A.6	I can get good grades if I want. (1.3)	____	____	____
A.7	I often get discouraged in school. (2.3)	____	____	____
A.8	I am proud of my school work. (1.3)	____	____	____
A.9	I often volunteer to do things in class. (1.3)	____	____	____
A.10	I find it hard to talk in front of the class. (1.3)	____	____	____
A.11	I don't like to be called on in class. (1.3)	____	____	____
A.12	School makes me want to learn. (2.3)	____	____	____

Instrument B
Parent Survey

For School Use

_____
Student name

_____
School code/prototype

_____
Date

Instructions to School Administrator/Evaluator: After selecting parents of children receiving Chapter 766 services using the recommended random sampling procedures, follow through to ensure that all selected parents respond to all of the survey questions.

Instructions to Parents: This survey is designed to evaluate your child's school program. Please answer each item with an "x." Respond in terms of the total school program as received by special needs students (i.e., all regular, special and tutorial education). Your responses will be kept confidential and used only for program evaluation purposes. Return this completed form in the enclosed envelope to_____

_____by_____.

		very much	some	very little	not at all	don't know doesn't apply
B.1	How much does your child benefit from the physical education program? (1.1)	____	____	____	____	____
B.2	How much does the school program help your child feel good about himself/herself? (1.2)	____	____	____	____	____
B.3	How much does the school program help your child develop good values and attitudes? (1.3)	____	____	____	____	____

Parent Survey (Cont.)	very much	some	very little	not at all	don't know doesn't apply
B.4 To what extent is the school program effective in teaching your child the following language arts skills: (2.1)					
Reading	____	____	____	____	____
Writing	____	____	____	____	____
Speaking	____	____	____	____	____
Spelling	____	____	____	____	____
B.5 To what extent is the school program effective in teaching your child Mathematical skills? (2.2)	____	____	____	____	____
B.6 How much does the school program make your child want to learn? (2.3)	____	____	____	____	____
B.7 To what extent is the school program effective in teaching your child about our country and its government? (3.1)	____	____	____	____	____
B.8 How much does the school program help your child believe in the rights and responsibilities of citizens? (3.2)	____	____	____	____	____
B.9 How much does the school program help your child develop good attitudes and behaviors toward the use of the environment? (5.1)	____	____	____	____	____

Parent Survey (Cont.)	very much	some	very little	not at all	don't know doesn't apply
B.10 How much does the school program help your child develop creative interests and talents? (6.1)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
B.11 To what extent does the school program encourage <u>your</u> participation in making school decisions? (8.1)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
B.12 To what extent does the school program encourage the general public's participation in making school decisions? (8.2)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
B.13 To what extent are the goals and objectives in your child's individualized education program written so that you can understand them and judge their success? (12.3)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Instrument C
Teacher Survey

_____
Date

Instructions to Administrator/Evaluator: Distribute this program evaluation survey to regular education and special education teachers randomly selected to represent the school district. Follow through to ensure that all teachers respond to all of the survey questions.

Instructions to Teachers: This survey will be used solely for program evaluation purposes and your individual responses will be kept confidential. Please answer each item with an "X." Respond in terms of the total school program as received by special needs students (i.e., all regular, special and tutorial education). Return the completed form to _____ by _____.

A. Name of Teacher: _____ Grade Level: _____

B. Position: ____Special Education ____Regular Education

C. Principle Prototype Served: The students you serve are assigned to one of the categories listed below. Please check the prototype most representative of your students:

_____	502.1	Regular education with program modification
_____	502.2	Regular education with no more than 25% time out
_____	502.3	Regular education with no more than 60% time out
_____	502.4	Substantially separate program
_____	502.4 (i)	Substantially separate program other than public school regular education facility
_____	502.5	Day school program
_____	502.6	Residential school program
_____	502.7	Home or hospital programs
_____	502.8 (a)	Home-based programs (3-4 year olds)
_____	502.8 (b)	Integrated center-based programs (3-4 year olds)
_____	502.8 (c)	Separate center-based programs (3-4 year olds)
_____	502.9	Diagnostic program
_____	502.11(a)	Programs for 16 through 21 year olds in other prototypes
_____	502.11(b)	TEAM-designed special programs (16-21 year olds)

Instrument C
Teacher Survey

	very much	some	very little	not at all	don't know doesn't apply
C.1 How much does the school program help the students feel good about themselves? (1.2)	___	___	___	___	___
C.2 How much does the school program foster the development of positive values and attitudes in the students? (1.3)	___	___	___	___	___
C.3 How much does the school program make students want to learn? (2.3)	___	___	___	___	___
C.4 How much does the school program provide the student with an understanding of our democratic society? (3.1)	___	___	___	___	___
C.5 How much does the school program encourage the students' commitment to their rights and responsibilities as citizens? (3.2)	___	___	___	___	___
C.6 How much does the school program help students' develop good attitudes and behaviors which lead to the intelligent use of the environment? (5.1)	___	___	___	___	___

Teacher Survey (Cont.)	very much	some	very little	not at all	don't know doesn't apply
C.7 How much does the school program provide for the student's development and expression of creative interests and talents? (6.1)	____	____	____	____	____
C.8 To what extent do the current special education student evaluations provide data required for sound educational planning? (7.2)	____	____	____	____	____
C.9 To what extent do the school facilities allow for the implementation of effective programs? (9.1)	____	____	____	____	____
C.10 To what extent is the range of school programs comprehensive in scope and quality? (9.2)	____	____	____	____	____
C.11 Considering current facilities, to what extent does the range of services provide a program which meets the individual needs of students? (9.3)	____	____	____	____	____
C.12 To what extent does the special education program provide inservice training which meets your skill needs? (10.1)	____	____	____	____	____

Teacher Survey (Cont.)	very much	some	very little	not at all	don't know doesn't apply
C.13 To what extent has staff inservice training enhanced your co-workers attitudes towards educating students with special needs in their classes? (10.2)	____	____	____	____	____
C.14 To what extent are the individual classroom programs which are unsuccessful in helping students achieve IEP goals identified in a systematic fashion? (12.1)	____	____	____	____	____
C.15 To what extent are these unsuccessful programs redesigned? (12.2)	____	____	____	____	____
C.16 To what extent are the goals and objectives in the IEPs written in measurable terms, allowing for the judgement of program success? (12.3)	____	____	____	____	____

COMMENTS:

Instrument D
Student Folder Review

_____
Student Name

Instructions to Administrator/Evaluator: For each student name randomly selected, identify a staff member with substantial TEAM skills to conduct the analysis. One staff member may be assigned multiple folders. To increase impartiality, if possible, assign staff that do not know the student whose folder they are evaluating. Follow through to ensure that all assigned ratings have been conducted. Only collect the Instrument D "Return Page" which does not include the student's name.

Instructions to Professional Conducting Rating: This instrument has been forwarded to you for the purposes of obtaining your professional judgment concerning the records of one student receiving Chapter 766 services. The rating you will make concerning the student's progress and IEP will be used only for the purposes of program evaluation. In fact, this rating is to be considered invalid for any other purpose such as student or staff evaluation. Although it is recognized that the responses on this rating sheet are somewhat subjective and not valid for individual student planning, it is hoped that aggregate responses across a prototype will prove useful in broad program planning.

There are two parts to this instrument, the Proficiency Rating and the IEP Goal Review.

Proficiency Rating

Instructions: The first part of this rating requires a professional judgment concerning the student's progress in two curriculum areas. Your task: (1) Review the student's folder thoroughly. (2) Identify the most recent properly administered standardized or proficiency test scores in language arts and mathematics. (3) Make the judgment whether the student has made satisfactory progress in language arts and mathematics, given the child's ability and handicapping condition. (4) Respond to the following statements in terms of the student's total (regular and special) educational progress over the past three years. Place your answers on the "Return Page" for items D.1 and D.2.

IEP Goal Review

Instructions: The second part of this rating requires an evaluation of the current IEP goals. Respond to questions D.3 and D.4 on the "Return Page."

Instrument D
Student Folder Review
"Return Page"

When fully completed, return this page only to:

Student Prototype: 502.( )
Date: _____

_____
Administrator/Evaluator

_____
Professional Rater Name

by: _____
Due Date

Proficiency Rating

D.1 This student is making satisfactory progress in language arts, given the student's ability and handicapping condition. (2.1)

_____ yes _____ no _____ don't know/ cannot determine

D.2 This student is making satisfactory progress in mathematics, given the student's ability and handicapping condition. (2.2)

_____ yes _____ no _____ don't know/ cannot determine

IEP Goal Review

D.3 The current IEP goals/objectives are stated clearly (12.3)

_____ yes _____ no _____ don't know/ cannot determine

D.4 The goals/objectives are stated so that it will be possible to determine whether a student has met them. (12.3)

_____ yes _____ no _____ don't know/ cannot determine

COMMENTS:

Instrument E
Related Services
Staff Survey

_____
Date

Instructions to Administrator/Evaluator: Distribute this program evaluation survey to all related services staff. Follow through to ensure that all such staff respond to all of the survey questions.

Instructions to Related Services Staff: This survey will be used solely for program evaluation purposes and your individual responses will be kept confidential. Please answer each item with an "X." Respond in terms of the total school program as received by special needs students (i.e., all regular, special and tutorial education). Return the completed form to _____ by _____.

A. Name: _____

B. Position: _____

C. Principle Prototype Served: The students you serve are assigned to one of the prototype categories listed below. Please check the prototype most representative of your students/case load:

_____	502.1	Regular education with program modification
_____	502.2	Regular education with no more than 25% time out
_____	502.3	Regular education with no more than 60% time out
_____	502.4	Substantially separate program
_____	502.4 (i)	Substantially separate program other than public school regular education facility
_____	502.5	Day school program
_____	502.6	Residential school program
_____	502.7	Home or hospital programs
_____	502.8 (a)	Home-based programs (3-4 year olds)
_____	502.8 (b)	Integrated center-based programs (3-4 year olds)
_____	502.8 (c)	Separate center-based programs (3-4 year olds)
_____	502.11(a)	Programs for 16 through 21 year olds in other prototypes
_____	502.11(b)	TEAM-designed special programs (16-21 year olds)

Instrument E
Related Services
Staff Survey

		very much	some	very little	not at all	don't know doesn't apply
E.1	How much does the school program provide pre-vocational and vocational training which will prepare students to obtain their initial job? (4.1)	____	____	____	____	____
E.2	How much does the school program provide students with an awareness of the changing employment market? (4.2)	____	____	____	____	____
E.3	How much does the school program help students develop good attitudes and behaviors which lead to the intelligent use of the environment? (5.1)	____	____	____	____	____
E.4	To what extent do the current special education student evaluations provide data required for sound educational planning? (7.2)	____	____	____	____	____
E.5	To what extent does the school program encourage parent's participation in making school decisions? (8.1)	____	____	____	____	____

Related Services Staff Survey (Cont.)	very much	some	very little	not at all	don't know doesn't apply
E.6 To what extent does the school program encourage the general public's participation in making school decisions? (8.2)	____	____	____	____	____
E.7 To what extent do the school facilities allow for the implementation of effective programs? (9.1)	____	____	____	____	____
E.8 To what extent is the range of school programs comprehensive in scope and quality? (9.2)	____	____	____	____	____
E.9 Considering current facilities, to what extent does the range of services provide a program which meets the individual needs of students? (9.3)	____	____	____	____	____
E.10 To what extent does the special education program provide inservice training which meets your skill needs? (10.1)	____	____	____	____	____
E.11 To what extent has staff inservice training enhanced your co-workers' attitudes towards educating students with special needs? (10.2)	____	____	____	____	____

Related Services Staff Survey (Cont.)	very much	some	very little	not at all	don't know doesn't apply
E.12 To what extent are the individual classroom programs which are unsuccessful in helping students achieve IEP goals identified in a systematic fashion? (12.1)	____	____	_____	_____	_____
E.13 To what extent are these unsuccessful programs redesigned? (12.2)	____	____	_____	_____	_____
E.14 To what extent are the goals and objectives in the IEPs written in measurable terms, allowing for the judgement of program success? (12.3)	____	____	_____	_____	_____

COMMENTS:

Instrument F
Special Education
Enrollment Comparison

Instructions to Administrator/Evaluator: This instrument is designed to take advantage of existing data which describes the numbers of children served by Chapter 766 programs. Your first task is to secure the most recent data available for your district, for the state, and (if possible) similar districts chosen for comparison. Two types of data are needed - overall prevalence figures and a breakout of students by prototype. Thus, two comparisons are to be made. Comparisons should be made among "same year" data.

Comparison #1 Directions

Fill in the following numbers:

Prevalence Figures

(Proportion of 766 students to the total student population) for: (7.1)

Your district _____

F.1 The State _____

*F.2 Similar districts _____

_____

_____

COMMENTS:

*The evaluator's judgment determines similar districts for comparisons.

Comparison #2 Directions

Compare your district's prototype data to the state and other prototype data. For each prototype, make the two comparisons.

F.3 With respect to prevalence by prototype, fill in the following table (11.1):

Prototype	District Prevalence	State Prevalence	Similar District Prevalence (Optional)
502.1			
502.2			
502.3			
502.4			
502.4 (i)			
502.5			
502.6			
502.7			
502.8 (a)			
502.8 (b)			
502.8 (c)			
502.9			
502.11(a)			
502.11(b)			

COMMENTS:

CHAPTER 7

DATA ANALYSIS AND REPORTING FORMAT

This chapter includes a guide to the analysis of the data collected using the instruments provided in Chapter 6. Further, tables are provided for the useful reporting and examination of data.

Data Analysis

The data analysis technique used in this handbook is the percentage (%). Its usefulness is high and the calculation burden is low. Most importantly, percentages provide interested parties a meaningful opportunity to discuss the results. When calculating percentage "satisfactory," remember to ignore "don't know" and "doesn't apply" responses. Further, it is suggested that the evaluator consider, and report such "don't know" and "doesn't apply" responses where appropropriate. For example, the evaluator should take notice if 90% of the respondents who should know about some aspect of program success respond with "don't know."

Whenever possible, it is suggested that a second person check over the calculations and confirm that no errors have been made. Since important decisions will be made based on these data, this extra effort for accuracy should be made.

A few suggestions concerning data analysis are in order. Extra photocopies of the instruments make excellent data worksheets for prototype totals. Whenever possible, efforts should be made to have clerical staff perform clerical duties in this process.

As in all of the chapters in this handbook, the work has been done

for the evaluator insofar as possible. However, there will be some calculation of percentages to do in this data analysis stage. Creative approaches such as making the data analysis a class project in the high school, or paying a mathematically inclined staff member to use a calculator, should not be overlooked--especially if your district is a large one.

A Caution

The suggested sampling technique in this handbook does not allow for the aggregation of findings across prototypes to produce a district-wide finding. To aggregate across prototypes, one would need to statistically weight prototype data according to district prevalence. A handbook user, choosing to aggregate across prototype, should consult with a statistical resource person. It should also be noted that much larger sample sizes would be required if this evaluation system were used for research purposes.

Tables for Results

The following pages contain "table shells" to display the results obtained during the data collection stage. When the percentages are filled in, these table shells become actual pages in your evaluation report. The evaluation question reference numbers are included after each instrument item as a reference. Of course, the evaluator may remove or modify certain table parts (e.g., the total column or unused prototypes) before reproduction. NOTE: Instruments C (teacher survey) and E (related services staff survey) do not collect data for children placed out of the district. Thus, there will be unused prototypes for instruments C and E.

The Evaluation Report

An evaluation report should consist of more than the completed tables and the recommendations (described in Chapter 8). A brief introduction should state the purpose of the evaluation, keeping the intended reader in mind. Factual statements about highlights in the tables should summarize the report findings. When the evaluator feels that the results do not accurately describe the district's accomplishments (e.g., because of low data return), limitations to the results should be noted in the evaluation report.

Alternatives

Alternative data analysis strategies are possible and are discussed in Appendix B. Likewise, alternative table shells may be considered worth the extra effort by some evaluators. For example, table shells could be organized by:

1. evaluation question number
2. multiple-instrument comparison
3. respondent group
4. school site
5. handicap (e.g., speech)

Instrument A
Student Survey
"Results"

DATE: _____

% SATISFACTORY BY PROTOTYPE

	.1	.2	.3	.4	.4i	.5	.6	.7	.8a	.8b	.8c	.9	.11a	.11b
A.1 Gym helps me stay in shape and keep fit. (1.1)														
A.2 I am easy to like. (1.2)														
A.3 I like being the way I am. (1.2)														
A.4 I am a good person. (1.2)														
A.5 School work is fairly easy for me. (2.3)														
A.6 I can get good grades if I want. (1.3)														
A.7 I often get discouraged in school. (2.3)														
A.8 I am proud of my school work. (1.3)														
A.9 I often volunteer to do things in class. (1.3)														
A.10 I find it hard to talk in front of the class. (1.3)														
A.11 I don't like to be called on in class. (1.3)														
A.12 School makes me want to learn. (2.3)														
NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN SAMPLE:														

Instrument B
Parent Survey
Results

DATE: _____

NOTE: This table shell combines responses into three groups: SATISFACTORY, UNSATISFACTORY, and DON'T KNOW. This is to make computation less complex. If more detailed analysis is desired, extra copies of Instrument B itself could be used as a table.

Here is the suggested data combination for most users:

SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY	DON'T KNOW
very much / some	very little / not at all	don't know

Note: To compute % satisfactory, do not include the "don't know" response.

% SATISFACTORY BY PROTOTYPE

	.1	.2	.3	.4	.4i	.5	.6	.7	.8a	.8b	.8c	.9	.11a	.11b
B.1 How much does your child benefit from the physical education program? (1.1)														
B.2 How much does the school program help your child feel good about himself/ herself? (1.2)														
B.3 How much does the school program help your child develop good values and attitudes? (1.3)														

69

Instrument B,
Parent Survey, Results: Page two

% SATISFACTORY BY PROTOTYPE

	.1	.2	.3	.4	.4i	.5	.6	.7	.8a	.8b	.8c	.9	.11a	.11b
B.4 To what extent is the school program effective in teaching your child the following language art skills: (2.1)														
Reading														
Writing														
Speaking														
Spelling														
B.5 To what extent is the school program effective in teaching your child mathematical skills? (2.2)														
B.6 How much does the school program make your child <u>want</u> to learn? (2.3)														
B.7 To what extent is the school program effective in teaching your child about our country and its government? (3.1)														
B.8 How much does the school program help your child <u>believe</u> in the rights and responsibilities of citizens? (3.2)														

Instrument B,
Parent Survey, Results: Page three

% SATISFACTORY BY PROTOTYPE

	.1	.2	.3	.4	.4i	.5	.6	.7	.8a	.8b	.8c	.9	.11a	.11b
B.9 How much does the school program help your child develop good attitudes and behaviors toward the use of the environment? (5.1)														
B.10 How much does the school program help your child develop creative interests and talents? (6.1)														
B.11 To what extent does the school program encourage <u>your</u> participation in making school decisions? (8.1)														
B.12 To what extent does the school program encourage the <u>general public's</u> participation in making school decisions? (8.2)														
B.13 To what extent are the goals and objectives in your child's individualized education program written so that you can understand them and judge the success? (12.3)														
TOTAL NUMBER OF PARENTS IN SAMPLE:														

Instrument C
Teacher Survey
Results

DATE: _____

Note: Satisfactory represents "very much" and "some" responses.
Unsatisfactory represents "very little" and "not at all."
Don't know responses are not represented here, but are retained by the evaluator.

Percentages of Regular and Special Educators Responding "Satisfactory"

PROTOTYPE

		.1	.2	.3	.4	.41	.5	.6	.7	.8a	.8b	.8c	.9	.11a	.11b
C.1 How much does the school program help the students feel good about themselves? (1.2)	Reg.														
	Spec.														
C.2 How much does the school program foster the development of positive values and attitudes in the students? (1.3)	Reg.														
	Spec.														
C.3 How much does the program foster the students' desire to learn? (2.3)	Reg.														
	Spec.														

Instrument C
Teacher Survey, Results: Page two

Percentages of Regular and Special Educators Responding "Satisfactory"

PROTOTYPE

		.1	.2	.3	.4	.4i	.5	.6	.7	.8a	.8b	.8c	.9	.11a	.11b
C.4	How much does the school program provide the student with an understanding of our democratic society? (3.1)	Reg.													
		Spec.													
C.5	How much does the school program encourage the students' commitment to their rights and responsibilities as citizens? (3.2)	Reg.													
		Spec.													
C.6	How much does the school program help students' develop good attitudes and behaviors which lead to the intelligent use of the environment? (5.1)	Reg.													
		Spec.													
C.7	How much does the school program provide for the students' development and expression of creative interests and talents? (6.1)	Reg.													
		Spec.													

Instrument C
Teacher Survey, Results: Page three

Percentages of Regular and Special Educators Responding "Satisfactory"

PROTOTYPE

		.1	.2	.3	.4	.4i	.5	.6	.7	.8a	.8b	.8c	.9	.11a	.11b
C.8 To what extent do the current special education student evaluations provide data required for sound educational planning? (7.2)	Reg.														
	Spec.														
C.9 To what extent do the school facilities allow for the implementation of effective programs? (9.1)	Reg.														
	Spec.														
C.10 To what extent is the range of school programs comprehensive in scope and quality? (9.2)	Reg.														
	Spec.														
C.11 Considering current facilities, to what extent does the range of services provide a program which meets the individual needs of the students? (9.3)	Reg.														
	Spec.														

74

Instrument C
Teacher Survey, Results: Page four

Percentages of Regular and Special Educators Responding "Satisfactory"

PROTOTYPE

		.1	.2	.3	.4	.41	.5	.6	.7	.8a	.8b	.8c	.9	.11a	.11b
C.12 To what extent does the special education program provide inservice training which meets your skill needs? (10.1)	Reg.														
	Spec.														
C.13 To what extent has staff inservice training enhanced your co-workers' attitudes towards educating students with special needs in their classes? (10.2)	Reg.														
	Spec.														
C.14 To what extent are the individual classroom programs which are unsuccessful in helping students achieve IEP goals identified in a systematic fashion? (12.1)	Reg.														
	Spec.														
C.15 To what extent are these unsuccessful programs redesigned? (12.2)	Reg.														
	Spec.														

75

Instrument C
Teacher Survey, Results: Page five

Percentages of Regular and Special Educators Responding "Satisfactory"

PROTOTYPE

		.1	.2	.3	.4	.4i	.5	.6	.7	.8a	.8b	.8c	.9	.11a	.11b
C.16 To what extent are the goals and objectives in the IEPs written in measurable terms, allowing for the judgment of program success? (12.3)	Reg.														
	Spec.														
NUMBER OF STAFF IN SAMPLE	Reg.														
	Spec.														

Instrument D
Student Folder Review
Results

DATE: _____

Percentage Satisfactory by Prototype

	.1	.2	.3	.4	.41	.5	.6	.7	.8a	.8b	.8c	.9	.11a	.11b
Proficiency Rating D.1 This student is making satisfactory progress in language arts, given the student's ability and handicapping condition. (2.1)														
D.2 This student is making satisfactory progress in mathematics, given the student's ability and handicapping condition. (2.2)														
IEP Goal Review D.3 The current IEP goals/ objectives are stated clearly. (12.3)														
D.4 The goals/objectives are stated so that it will be possible to determine whether a student has met them. (12.3)														
NUMBER OF FOLDERS IN SAMPLE:														

Instrument E
Related Services
Staff Survey
Results

DATE: _____

Note: Satisfactory represents "very much" and "some" responses.

Unsatisfactory represents "very little" and "not at all."

Don't know responses are not represented here, but are retained by the evaluator.

Percentages of Related Services Staff Responding "Satisfactory"

PROTOTYPE

	.1	.2	.3	.4	.4i	.5	.6	.7	.8a	.8b	.8c	.9	.11a	.11b
E.1 How much does the school program provide pre-vocational and vocational training which will prepare students to obtain their initial job? (4.1)														
E.2 How much does the school program provide students with an awareness of the changing employment market? (4.2)														
E.3 How much does the school program help students develop good attitudes and behaviors which lead to the intelligent use of the environment? (5.1)														

Instrument E
Related Services
Staff Survey Results: Page two

Percentages of Related Services Staff Responding "Satisfactory"

PROTOTYPE

	.1	.2	.3	.4	.4i	.5	.6	.7	.8a	.8b	.8c	.9	.11a	.11b
E.4 To what extent do the current special education student evaluations provide data required for sound educational planning? (7.2)														
E.5 To what extent does the school program encourage parent's participation in making school decisions? (8.1)														
E.6 To what extent does the school program encourage the general public's participation in making school decisions? (8.2)														
E.7 To what extent do the school facilities allow for the implementation of effective programs? (9.1)														

Instrument E
Related Services
Staff Survey Results: Page three

Percentages of Related Services Staff Responding "Satisfactory"

PROTOTYPE

	.1	.2	.3	.4	.4i	.5	.6	.7	.8a	.8b	.8c	.9	.11a	.11b
E.8 To what extent is the range of school programs comprehensive in scope and quality? (9.2)														
E.9 Considering current facilities, to what extent does the range of services provide a program which meets the individual needs of students? (9.3)														
E.10 To what extent does the special education program provide inservice training which meets your skill needs? (10.1)														
E.11 To what extent has staff inservice training enhanced your co-workers' attitudes towards educating students with special needs? (10.2)														

Instrument E
Related Services
Staff Survey Results: Page four

Percentages of Related Services Staff Responding "Satisfactory"

PROTOTYPE

	.1	.2	.3	.4	.4i	.5	.6	.7	.8a	.8b	.8c	.9	.11a	.11b
E.12 To what extent are the individual classroom programs which are unsuccessful in helping students achieve IEP goals identified in a systematic fashion? (12.1)														
E.13 To what extent are these unsuccessful programs redesigned? (12.2)														
E.14 To what extent are the goals and objectives in the IEPs written in measurable terms, allowing for the judgment of program success? (12.3)														
TOTAL NUMBER OF RELATED SERVICE STAFF IN SAMPLE:														

Instrument F
Special Education
Enrollment Comparison
Results

DATE: _____

F.1 Findings concerning district and State special education prevalence.

F.2 Findings concerning district and similar districts' special education prevalence.

F.3 Findings concerning prototype prevalence.

CHAPTER 8

FORMULATING REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter will present some guidelines for generating recommendations based upon the information gathered during the evaluation process. Since there are several instruments involved, it will be most helpful to organize your recommendations around the Evaluation Questions presented in Chapter 4. To facilitate the development of recommendations, the table in this chapter presents each evaluation question, the appropriate data sources, and the instrument item number.

In developing your recommendations, consider each evaluation question and the appropriate information you have gathered. To complete the process, the following steps should be followed:

1. The criteria you selected in Chapter 4 for the successful attainment of each objective should be entered into the spaces provided in the table. NOTE: If you selected the longitudinal criteria approach, you will enter actual attainment levels. In the steps which follow, your priorities will be developed by rank ordering these actual attainment levels.
2. Circle those evaluation question numbers where criterion level has not been met.*
3. For these evaluation questions, consider the discrepancy between the desired and attained levels as well as your district resources.

* Note: For a few items in the student survey, the item stems were written in the negative direction. If you selected a criterion level of 90%, you will have to use a criterion of 10% or less (for example, the student survey item A.11, "I don't like to be called on in class", would be such a negative item stem.)

4. On the basis of these considerations, rank order the numbers of the evaluation questions to set tentative priorities for your future program efforts.
5. List the appropriate program goals and objectives (See Chapter 3) associated with these evaluation questions.
6. Review the targeted goals and objectives with concerned groups and individuals (e.g., parent committees, teachers, and administrators) in an attempt to finalize program priorities.
7. Develop a list of recommendations for successful attainment of the objectives based upon the input of these groups and individuals.
8. Develop a management plan to implement the program objectives.

To assist in the implementation of the recommendations, a Program Improvement Management Plan has been provided. This plan will serve as a guideline for program improvement activities, as well as the basis for a later process evaluation of these program activities.

	Evaluation Question	Instrument	Data Source	Instrument Item Number	Criterion Level
1.1	Are students benefiting from regular physical education and special physical education?	A	Student Survey	A.1	
		B	Parent Survey	B.1	
1.2	Do students exhibit positive self concepts?	A	Student Survey	A.2, A.3, A.4	
		B	Parent Survey	B.2	
		C	Teacher Survey	C.1	
1.3	Do students develop positive values and attitudes?	A	Student Survey	A.6, A.8, A.9, A.10, A.11	
		B	Parent Survey	B.3	
		C	Teacher Survey	C.2	
2.1	Do students achieve a level of language art skills commensurate with their ability?	B	Parent Survey	B.4	
		D	Student Folder Review	D.1	
2.2	Do students achieve a level of mathematic skills commensurate with their ability?	B	Parent Survey	B.5	
		D	Student Folder Review	D.2	
2.3	Do students exhibit a desire to learn?	A	Student Survey	A.5, A.7, A.12	
		B	Parent Survey	B.6	
		C	Teacher Survey	C.3	

	Evaluation Question	Instrument	Data Source	Instrument Item Number	Criterion Level
3.1	Have students been provided an understanding of our democratic society?	B	Parent Survey	B.7	
		C	Teacher Survey	C.4	
3.2	Have students developed a commitment to citizenship rights and responsibilities?	B	Parent Survey	B.8	
		C	Teacher Survey	C.5	
4.1	Are students prepared to obtain their initial job?	E	Related Services Staff Survey	E.1	
4.2	Do students possess skills and attitudes necessary to obtain employment in a changing job market?	E	Related Services Staff Survey	E.2	
5.1	Have students developed attitudes and behaviors which lead to intelligent use of the environment?	B	Parent Survey	B.9	
		C	Teacher Survey	C.6	
		E	Related Services Staff Survey	E.3	
6.1	Have students developed creative interests and talents?	B	Parent Survey	B.10	
		C	Teacher Survey	C.7	
7.1	Are special education programs serving the intended recipients?	F	Special Education Enrollment Comparison	F.1, F.2	

	Evaluation Question	Instrument	Data Source	Instrument Item Number	Criterion Level
7.2	Do special education child evaluation activities facilitate sound educational planning for individual students?	C	Teacher Survey	C.8	
		E	Related Services Staff Survey	E.4	
8.1	Do special education programs encourage a working partnership between parents and the school concerning school decisions?	B	Parent Survey	B.11	
		E	Related Services Staff Survey	E.5	
8.2	Do special education programs encourage a working partnership between the general public and the school concerning school decisions?	B	Parent Survey	B.12	
		E	Related Services Staff Survey	E.6	
9.1	Do special education programs use school facilities of high quality?	C	Teacher Survey	C.9	
		E	Related Services Staff Survey	E.7	
9.2	Do special education programs offer a range of services of high quality?	C	Teacher Survey	C.10	
		E	Related Services Staff Survey	E.8	

	Evaluation Question	Instrument	Data Source	Instrument Item Number	Criterion Level
9.3	Do special education programs provide facilities and services which meet unique student needs?	C	Teacher Survey	C.11	
		E	Related Services Staff Survey	E.9	
10.1	Does the special education program provide inservice training which meets staff skill needs?	C	Teacher Survey	C.12	
		E	Related Services Staff Survey	E.10	
10.2	Does the special education program provide inservice training which improves staff attitudes?	C	Teacher Survey	C.13	
		E	Related Services Staff Survey	E.11	
11.1	Do special education TEAMS make decisions which meet the intent of least restrictive environment provisions in law	F	Special Education Enrollment Comparison	F.3	
12.1	Are the individual classroom programs which are unsuccessful in helping children achieve IEP goals identified in a systematic fashion?	C	Teacher Survey	C.14	
		E	Related Services Staff Survey	E.12	

	Evaluation Question	Instrument	Data Source	Instrument Item Number	Criterion Level
12.2	Are unsuccessful classroom programs redesigned?	C	Teacher Survey	C.15	
		E	Related Services Staff Survey	E.13	
12.3	Are IEP goals written in a manner which allows the TEAM to judge program success?	B	Parent Survey	B.13	
		C	Teacher Survey	C.16	
		D	Student Folder Review	D.3, D.4	
		E	Related Services Staff Survey	E.14	

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

PROTOTYPES NEEDING IMPROVEMENT

ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN/TIME-LINES

PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE

BUDGET NEEDS

FACILITIES NEEDS

TARGET CRITERION LEVEL(S) FOR NEXT FORMAL PROGRAM EVALUATION

APPENDIX A

ADDITIONAL READINGS

Included in this appendix are annotated references for more advanced reading in the area of program evaluation. The references have been categorized into three sections as follows:

I. General Evaluation References

II. Evaluation of Special Education Programs

III. ERIC Documents

The ERIC documents represent publications dealing mainly with evaluating special education programs. Your local college, university, or regional educational center can assist you in obtaining either papercopy of microfiche copies of the documents.

All references preceded by an asterisk (*) are those which are most highly recommended for further reading.

I. General Evaluation References

Alkin, M.C., Daillak, R., & White, P. Using Evaluations. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1979.

Contains excellent case studies and discussion of the utilization of evaluations.

Anderson, S.B., & Ball, S. The Profession and Practice of Program Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Presents a practical guide to program evaluation and raises several issues addressed by evaluators. Contains discussions of ethics and values in evaluation as well as the training of evaluators.

Anderson, S.B., Ball, S., & Murphy, R.T. Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

A collection of over 100 short papers such as models, functions of evaluation, objectives and standards, planning and design, variables, measurement, and analysis and integration. A good shelf reference.

Borich, G. (Ed.). Evaluating Educational Programs and Products. Englewood Cliffs: Educational Technology Publications, 1974.

A series of 16 papers on various evaluation topics such as evaluation context, models and strategies, and methods and techniques.

*Borich, G.D. Program evaluation: new concepts, new methods. Focus on Exceptional Children, 1977, 9, No. 3.

Presents a six-stage model for program evaluation based upon identifying and judging the adequacy of all program components.

*California State Department of Education. Program Evaluator's Guide. Princeton: ETS, 1979.

A highly recommended guidebook outlining all phases of the evaluation process. Sections include planning, evaluation design, instrument development, data collection and analysis, reporting results, and applying results.

Glass, G.V. Evaluation Studies, Review Annual. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1976.

Volume I of annual volumes containing over 25 papers on several evaluation topics. All volumes to date are excellent resource books.

*Grobe, R.P. Evaluation - what's it all about? NASSP Bulletin, December 1978, 1-14.

An easily read discussion of the purposes of evaluation. Several models are described briefly and the Stufflebeam CIPP model is emphasized.

Grobman, H. Evaluation Activities of Curriculum Projects. AERA Monograph Series, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1968.

The second in a series of 5 evaluation monographs produced by AERA. This issue deals with curriculum evaluation and offers several practical tips to the evaluator.

House, E.R. The Logic of Evaluative Argument. CSE Monograph Series in Evaluation, Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, 1977.

An advanced treatment of the evaluation process. Contains reviews of Glass's "Educational Product Evaluation," Scriven's review of Glass's paper, and a discussion of naturalistic evaluation.

Levitan, S., & Wurzburg, G. Evaluating Federal Social Programs. Kalamazoo: W.E. Upjohn Institute, 1979.

Presents an interesting discussion of the evaluation of social programs viewed from the legislative and executive branches. Also contains a good section on evaluation "making a difference."

*Matezynski, T., & Rogers, J. Program evaluation: a workable format. NASSP Bulletin, March 1979, 63-77.

Several stages are described for translating evaluation theory into practice. The process of evaluation is structured around a series of questions to be addressed. Easily read and practical article.

Matuszek, P. Designing internally-based program evaluations in school settings. Journal of School Psychology, 1978, 16, No. 4, 346-355.

The worth of evaluation activities depends heavily on the use made of evaluation results. This paper discusses some ways a psychologist carrying out evaluation within a school system can design evaluation studies to maximize the usefulness of the results. A format and procedure for designs based on providing information for decision making are presented. Examples of the experiences of one internal office are discussed, and some general suggestions for optimizing evaluation utilization are provided.

*Morris, L.L. (Ed.). Program Evaluation Kit. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1978.

A highly recommended series of 8 booklets every evaluator should have on the shelf. Included are: Evaluator's Handbook Goals and Objectives, Designing Evaluations, Measuring Program Implementation, Measuring Attitudes, Measuring Achievement, Statistics, and Presenting the Report.

*New Jersey Department of Education. Information for Assessment and Evaluation. Princeton: ETS, 1977.

Highly recommended handbook including sections on goal setting, objective development, standard development, needs assessment and program evaluation.

*Patton, M.E. Utilization - Focused Evaluation. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1978.

An excellent text for program evaluation with an emphasis on utilizing evaluation results. Reviews several strategies for goal setting.

Payne, D.A. (Ed.). Curriculum Evaluation. Lexington, MA., D.C. Heath, 1974.

A book of readings on curriculum evaluation. Topics covered include: purposes of evaluation, program goals and objectives, planning evaluations, measurement techniques, and illustrative evaluations.

Popham, W.J. An Evaluation Guidebook. Los Angeles: The Instructional Objectives Exchange, 1972.

A concise treatment of evaluating school programs. Contains sections on behavioral objectives, measurement, data collection and analysis, and evaluation guidelines.

*Popham, W.J. Educational Evaluation. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

A text on evaluating school programs. Contains sections of curriculum objectives, criterion-referenced testing, evaluation models, and teacher evaluation.

Provus, M. Discrepancy Evaluation. Berkeley: McCutchon, 1972.

A complicated, but comprehensive treatment of Provus' discrepancy evaluation model.

*Provus, M. "The Discrepancy Evaluation Model." In P.A. Taylor & D.M. Cowley (Ed.), Readings in Curriculum Evaluation. Dubuque: Wm. Brown, 1972.

A highly recommended concise, but thorough, presentation of the discrepancy model.

Reilly, D.H. Program evaluation and system change: some issues and considerations. Journal of School Psychology, 16. No. 4, 368-374.

This paper explores some of the issues concerning the acceptance or rejection of positive program evaluation data by the system in which the program is embedded. System acceptance and diffusion rates are considered as functions of first or second-order change factors. Several approaches to enhancing the probability of second-order change are presented and discussed.

*Renzulli, J.S. A Guidebook for Evaluating Programs for the Gifted and Talented. Los Angeles: National/State Leadership Training Institute, 1975.

A clear, concise and practical handbook for evaluating any type of educational program. Contains several survey forms and rating scales in addition to reviews of various popular program evaluation models by Stake, Provus and Stufflebeam.

*Rossi, P.H., Freeman, H.E., & Wright, S.R. Evaluation: A Systematic Approach. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1979.

A highly recommended comprehensive treatment of program evaluation. Contains sections on evaluating program planning, implementation, impact, as well as cost benefit analysis.

Sanders, J.R. School professionals and the evaluation function. Journal of School Psychology, 1978, 16, No. 4., 301-311.

Evaluation is assumed to be an integral part of the professional delivery of school services. As such, professionals employed in school systems are called upon to define alternative roles they might play in evaluation, to consider alternative ways to organize for evaluation, and to focus on various objects of evaluation. Listed alternatives were drawn from emerging literature in school evaluation. Standards suggested for judging school evaluation included those addressing accuracy, utility, propriety, and feasibility of the evaluation.

Sandoval, J. Methodological issues in school-based evaluation. Journal of School Psychology, 1978, 16, No. 4, 356-367.

Methodology in school-based evaluation is importantly affected by economic and ethical constraints often absent or less pressing than in larger-scale evaluations. These and other factors also operate in the specialized school-based evaluations such as that of school psychological services. Defensible evaluation designs must take into account the impossibility of random assignment and reduced options for the use of control groups. In addition there are numerous pressures on the construction and deployment of measuring devices and a need for ingenuity in performing statistical analyses. This article explicates these issues and outlines alternative approaches to methodology which can result in usable data for school decision making.

Stufflebeam, D.L. "Evaluation as Enlightenment for Decision Making." In Improving Educational Assessment and an Inventory of Measures of Affective Behavior. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1969.

A highly recommended treatment of Stufflebeam's CIPP model. The context, input, process and product components are discussed and illustrated.

Stufflebeam, D.L., et al. Educational Evaluation and Decision Making. Itasca: Peacock Publishers, 1971.

The original source for Stufflebeam's CIPP evaluation model. Thoroughly presents the decision making process and evaluation model.

Stufflebeam, D.L., & Webster, W.J. An analysis of alternative approaches to evaluation. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, May-June 1980, 2, No. 3, 5-20.

Discusses diverse ways in which educational evaluation has been conceptualized. Presents and analyzes 13 types of evaluation studies categorized into the following three areas: politically oriented, questions oriented, and values oriented. Educators are warned that discrepancies in perceptions of the type of study being conducted can be quite serious for the evaluator and the audience of the report.

Western Michigan Evaluation Center. Occasional Paper Series, Evaluation Report Series, and Instructional Aids Series. Kalamazoo: College of Education, 1975+.

These three series represent several excellent papers and reports on evaluation. All aspects of program evaluation are covered. The approximately 15 documents in the series are excellent shelf references.

II. Evaluation of Special Education Programs

Anderson, L.H., Borner, S.L., & Larson, H.J. Evaluation of written individualized education programs. Exceptional Children, November 1978, 207-208.

Over 400 IEPs with 2400 instructional objectives were rated by four evaluators. Recommendations are forwarded for improving IEP development in the areas of goal statements, objectives, parent communication, and student emotional, social and behavioral needs.

Bagnato, S.J., or Neisworth, J.T. The intervention efficiency index: an approach to preschool program accountability. Exceptional Children, January 1980, 264-269.

Intervention programs claiming to benefit young children are increasingly being required to provide evidence of their effectiveness. An Intervention Efficiency Index (IEI) is proposed as a method of measuring child progress and program impact by relating changes in children's developmental capabilities to time spent in a program. A series of steps involved in computing an IEI is presented. Research data supporting application of the IEI in two different preschool programs for handicapped children are analyzed and discussed.

Baily, D.B., & Horbin, G.L. Nondiscriminatory evaluation. Exceptional Children, May 1980, 590-596.

Discusses the issue of bias in the assessment and placement of children with special needs. The need for interdisciplinary teams during the evaluation process, which focus on child survival skills in the academic, as well as the total environment is presented.

*Carr, R.A. Goal attainment scaling as a useful tool for evaluating progress in special education. Exceptional Children, October 1979, 88-95.

Goal attainment scaling is presented as a method to assist special educators to become accountable and effective and to increase the likelihood that special education will become student-centered rather than method-centered. The method involves devising a set of goals with involved persons, assigning weights to these goals, developing a set of expected outcomes for each goal, scoring the outcomes, and calculating a summary score of the outcomes across the goals. Both individual progress and program effectiveness can be assessed regardless of theoretical orientation. Mutual determination of goals and their weightings insures relevance and meaning to parents, teachers, and students. Visibility and clarity meet administrative needs. The scoring system enables research questions to be answered, while overall evaluation enables administrators to make program decisions. Examples of specific scales applicable to special education are presented and several methods for scoring are illustrated.

Cober, J.G., Hayes, R.B., Mulvihill, P.J., & Reynolds, R.N. Pennsylvania programs for the handicapped get good marks for quality, cost and effectiveness. Phi Delta Kappa, 1978, 60, 60-61.

Illustrates data presentation to support program quality, student progress, and program cost.

*Dunst, C.J. Program evaluation and the Education for All Handicapped Act. Exceptional Children, September 1979, 24-31.

Public Law 94-142 states that the impact of programs authorized under the Act be adequately evaluated. This article describes the evaluation requirements as delineated in the Act and specifies the type of evaluation that is necessary to meet the stated requirements. An experimental evaluation approach is recommended for assessing the efficacy of programs and projects operated under the Act. Examples of the use of quasi experimental designs for evaluative purposes are presented.

Hauser, M.A. Evaluating mainstream programs: capitalizing on a victory. The Journal of Special Education, 1979, 13, No. 2, 107-129.

Evaluation of mainstream programs is becoming a prominent concern in recent special education literature. An extensive literature on planned organizational changes and responsiveness to change and innovation provides its primary support base. Davis's (1973) A VICTORY model of factors associated with organizational change represents one distillation of this literature. A VICTORY is presented descriptively, drawing parallels among its 8 factors and aspects of mainstream programs. Although formal, proven instruments for making use of A VICTORY in formative evaluations have not yet emerged; the model itself suggests potential strategies. General guidelines for identifying purposes, sampling, and instrumentation requirements are presented briefly. Conclusions call for evaluators to: (a) deal actively with the complexities, intricacies, and dynamics in the organizational context of mainstream programs, and, (b) deemphasize generalizability as a goal for evaluation in favor of focus on program-specific interactions, their precise descriptions, and documentation.

Hoover, J.G. The school psychologist in evaluating educational programs. Journal of School Psychology, 1978, 16, No. 4, 312-321.

A discussion of school psychology practice is presented, with emphasis on school programs rather than on individuals. While pressures exist to continue emphasizing the individual as the unit of study, current literature in evaluation theory and community psychology suggest a more viable model for the practice of school psychology. The learning process as it occurs in school programming is discussed, illustrating potential sources of involvement for school psychologists in effecting change in education. It is suggested that school psychologists, operating from a framework of evaluation theory, are well suited to be evaluators of school programs.

*Jones, R.L., Gottlieb, J., Guskin, S., & Yoshida, R.K. Evaluating mainstreaming programs: models, caveats, considerations, and guidelines. Exceptional Children, May 1978, 588-601.

Discusses a variety of practical and theoretical issues pertinent to the evaluation of mainstreaming programs. Includes sections on evaluation models, instructional time, goals and objectives, monitoring child progress, attitude and achievement as well as program cost/effectiveness. Discussion pertains to requirements of PL94-142. Guidelines are presented for developing and appraising evaluation reports.

Kennedy, M.M. Developing an evaluation plan for Public Law 94-142. In C. Rentz & R. Rentz (Eds.), Evaluating Federally Sponsored Programs (Vol. 2). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Discusses the planning process for developing an evaluation plan. Included are evaluation questions, methodologies, value and use of evaluation findings.

Kratochwell, T.R., & Bergan, J.R. Evaluating programs in applied settings through behavioral consultation. Journal of School Psychology, 1978, 16, No. 4, 375-386.

A behavioral consultation school psychology service model is presented which provides a vehicle for services and communication of process and outcome measures in program evaluation research. Within the context of the problem-solving perspective of applied behavior analysis, the consultation model (a) promotes process and outcome evaluation across a wide variety of settings, situations, and time; (b) leads to use of an applied research technology with wide applicability in educational settings; and (c) provides a communication technology for the program evaluation process through a four-stage problem-solving strategy. It is argued that the professional behavioral school psychologist can provide technical expertise to function as a system change agent within this evaluation model.

Lidz, C.S. Criterion - referenced assessment: the new bandwagon? Exceptional Children, October 1979, 131-133.

Discusses the advantages and limitations of the criteria-referenced approach to assessment.

*MacMillan, D.L., & Semmel, M.I. Evaluation of mainstreaming programs. Focus on Exceptional Children, September 1977, 9, No. 4.

Presents a model for evaluating special education programs. Discusses instrumentation to be used, variables to be measured and interpretations of data.

Maher, C.A. A synoptic framework for school program evaluation. Journal of School Psychology, 1978, 16, No. 4, 322-333.

> A broad-based conceptual schema, termed the Synoptic Evaluation Framework (SEF), is discussed in relation to providing school program evaluation services. Derived from evaluation theory and practice, the SEF allows for the design and conduct of a range of program evaluation studies within the school context. Moreover, the SEF has been used as a basis for training doctoral school psychology students in program evaluation. The SEF consists of three constituent dimensions; (a) Evaluation Unit, (b) Evaluation Purpose, and (c) Evaluation Service. An understanding of the interactions among these dimensions enables an evaluator to identify the specific programmatic concerns of a decision maker and to design and conduct a responsive evaluation.

*Maher, C.A. School psychologists and special education program evaluation: contributions and considerations. Psychology in the Schools, 1979, 16, No. 2, 240-245.

> The contribution of the practicing psychologist, including the school psychologist, to the area of program evaluation has been increasingly discussed in a general way in the literature. Despite this discourse, little attention has been given to specific areas within school systems in which program evaluation is needed, and to which school psychologists might contribute. This paper examines special education as one such potential area. In this regard, dimensions of special education program evaluations are explicated; and the issues of units of program evaluation activity, data aggregation, and the delivery of special education program evaluation are discussed. These issues are presented for the consideration of school psychologists, so that they might contribute to developing the area of special education program evaluation.

*Maher, C.A., & Barbrack, C.R. A framework for the comprehensive evaluation of the individualized education program (IEP). Learning Disability Quarterly, Summer 1980, 3, 49-55.

This article describes an Evaluation Framework that allows for comprehensive evaluation of the Individualized Education Program (IEP). Within the Framework, IEP evaluation is seen as a multifaceted process, undertaken by an IEP evalutor, in order to provide evaluation information to IEP planners and implementers on various aspects of the IEP. Thus, through the systematic use of the Framework, information is obtained about the design of the IEP by means of an evaluability assessment; information about the operations of the IEP by means of a process evaluation; information about the outcome of the IEP by means of an outcome evaluation; and information about the usefulness of the IEP by means of a consumer evaluation. The discussion focuses on appropriate utilization of each evaluation strategy. In addition, several potential problems related to implementation of the Evaluation Framework are highlighted and suggestions are offered for their resolution.

Maher, C.A., & Barbrack, C.R. Perspective and principles for the evaluation of special-service programs. The Journal of Special Education, 1979, 13, No. 4, 413-420.

A conceptual perspective and set of principles are offered for the evaluation of special-service programs in public school settings. Special-service program evaluation is seen as a process of obtaining and reporting information on a program's adequacy, process, efficiency, and impact. The evaluation perspective and five evaluation principles set forth serve to guide the evaluation process, enabling the evaluator to (a) accurately identify the information (evaluation) needs of the decision maker(s), (b) design and conduct an evaluation study focused on these needs, and (c) assess the contribution of the evaluation to programmatic decision making.

*Maher, C.A., & Kratochwill, T.R. Principles and procedures of program evaluation: an overview. School Psychology Monograph, Fall 1980, 1-24.

An overview of program evaluation is provided, with particular focus on evaluation of special service programs in public schools. Program evaluation is seen as contributing to the program decision making process through the provision of the program evaluation services of needs assessment, process evaluation, and outcome evaluation. Appropriate provision of these services by an evaluator (e.g., school psychologist) helps a decision maker (e.g., administrator, teacher) make informed judgments about program development, modification, and outcome. In the paper, the various kinds of program decisions are identified, the ways in which program evaluation serves those decisions are described, and guidelines for providing responsive program evaluation services are delineated. Discussion occurs within the context of school psychology.

Miller, T.L., & Sabatino, D.A. An evaluation of the teacher consultant model as an approach to mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, October 1978, 86-91.

Two special education resource service models are contrasted for their effects on student achievement and on teacher and pupil behavior. Academic performance gains were equivalent for both models (teacher consultant and resource room), while teacher behaviors were judged slightly better under the teacher consultant model. Both approaches were superior to controls (no service). The parallel academic gains coupled with improved teacher behaviors suggest utility in having both models in operation within a continuum of services. The data support increased instruction in the regular classroom, thereby promoting many of the goals of mainstreaming through education in the least restrictive alternative, improved regular teacher skills, and attenuation of the effects of labeling.

Ozer, M. The assessment of children with developmental problems. Exceptional Children, September 1977, 37-38.

Discusses a problem solving methodology to be used in the development of IEPs.

Stager, J.D. Assessing public school programs for the visually handicapped. Visual Impairment and Blindness, May 1978, 170-172.

Stresses that programs developed for the education of visually handicapped children in public schools must be evaluated in order to better serve the children and to justify continued support for the programs. Describes the Program Assessment of Special Education Services to Children with Special Needs with Regard to Vision that has been field tested in several Massachusetts' school districts.

Strichart, S.S. Evaluation model for the outcomes of individual remediation programs. Academic Therapy, 1978, 14, No. 2, 193-202.

Describes procedures for evaluation outcomes of remedial efforts with LD children. A sample evaluation report is included to illustrate effective communication of results.

Thomas E.D., & Marshall, M.J. Clinical evaluation and coordination of services: an ecological model. Exceptional Children, September 1977, 16-22.

A four phase ecological working model for the clinical evaluation and coordination of services for the child with a handicap is presented. This model, based on the experience of a medically based multi-disciplinary program, stresses the importance of coordinated services in order that the family can view the interrelationship of each component (medical, educational, and family) of the child's habilitation program. In order for this to take place, interdisciplinary and intra-disciplinary communication must occur.

Worthen, B.R., & Owens, T.R. Adversary evaluation and the school psychologist. Journal of School Psychology, 1978, 16, No. 4, 334-345.

This article describes adversary evaluation and explains its use in evaluation of school-based programs by school psychologists. The authors discuss the history of adversary evaluation, the various models which have been used, and major research findings. Three diverse examples of adversary evaluation are presented, along with criteria for evaluating such models. In addition the article raises some potential concerns regarding the use of adversary evaluation, and suggests potential roles that school psychologists might play within this paradigm.

Ysseldyke, J.E., & Regan, R.R. Nondiscriminatory assessment: a formative model. Exceptional Children, March 1980, 465-466.

Focuses on the provisions of PL 94-142 typically referred to as the "Protection in Evaluation Procedures." Nondiscriminatory assessment strategies are described.

III. ERIC Documents

Brehman, George R., et al. Special education indicators of quality. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania State Department of Education, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 145-645)

Described in the development of an instrument to evaluate the relationship between expenditures and effectiveness of special education programs. It is explained that the quality indicator instrument, developed through the Delphi process and refined through item analysis, consists of 38 items in seven areas, including instructional setting, instructional process, administrative support and information systems, and integration with regular classrooms. Included is a sample instrument and scoring sheet.

Dykes, M.K., et al. Assessment and evaluation strategies for early childhood programs. Gainsville: Florida Educational Research and Development Council, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 171 377)

This brief monograph, intended for preschool teachers and administrators, explains various aspects of the assessment and evaluation of children and early childhood education programs. The value of evaluation procedures for program development is noted. The different forms that research designs and tests can take are explained. It is emphasized that the persons responsible for evaluation must choose tests and research designs which do measure what they are supposed to measure; examples are used to show how this can fail to happen if care is not taken. The information the examiner should have about each child prior to testing is indicated. A checklist of conditions for testing (e.g., good lighting and quiet) and federal requirements for evaluation are included.

Florida State Department of Education. A resource manual for the development and evaluation of special programs for exceptional students. Tallahassee: Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students, 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 161 226)

> This volume is designed to provide Florida's school districts with recommendations and suggestions for the development, management, and evaluation of programs for the emotionally handicapped. Thirteen sections cover the following areas: definition, criteria for eligibility, procedures for screening, procedures for referral, procedures for evaluation, procedures for determining eligibility and placement, procedures for dismissal or reassignment, program organization and facilities, transportation, teacher requirements and competencies, instructional program, supportive services, inservice education, parent involvement, program evaluation, and selected readings. Appended are sample forms, checklists, and rating scales.

Footman, Gordon E., et al. Pupil personnel services guidelines for program evaluation. National Association of Pupil Personnel Administrators, 1977. (ERIC Document Service No. ED 173 940)

> This monograph attempts to approach educational program evaluation from a total program approach rather than from the level of student achievement. Although intended for use in pupil personnel areas, it also has applicability in other areas. It begins with definitions of program evaluation, including formative and summative evaluation. The step-by-step procedure for conducting an educational needs assessment is explained. One chapter deals with establishing performance objectives. Planning the evaluation program and monitoring progress are explained. Steps for collecting data for a formative evaluation are outlined as are steps and instrumentation for conducting a summative evaluation.

Kunkel, Richard C., & Tucker, Susan A. A perception-based model of program evaluation: a values oriented theory. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 152 809)

> This model assumes a values-oriented evaluation encompassing the following criteria; holism, helpfulness toward program improvement, evaluator vulnerability, acceptance of both hard (observable) and soft (subjective) data sources, and facilitation of planning a program's future. Additional quality criteria are negotiated with individual audiences.

Mitchell, David R. A systems approach to designing and evaluating special education. Paper presented at the World Conference on Future Special Education, Scotland, June 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 157 370)

> A systems model offers an orderly way of identifying and evaluating the complex components and relationships that are present in special education systems. When applied to national or local systems of special education, it is possible to derive convenient profiles of their strengths and weaknesses, and thus to generate future improvements. As well as having utility at this macroscopic level, the model can also be applied to the planning of single pieces of action research and to individual case work.

*New Jersey State Department of Public Instruction. Guide for evaluation of special education programs and related pupil personnel services. Trenton, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 181 060)

> Two purposes are served by this guide; to allow school districts to examine their special education programs and related pupil personnel services, and to aid state departments of education in evaluating the nature, scope, and quality of school district offerings to handicapped students. The guide is divided into two parts: one provides forms for tabulating data and the other consists of chapters, each dealing with a specific component to be assessed. Criteria, derived from federal and state legislation and regulations and professional practices, are listed for evaluating each component. Questions are also provided to assist in examining the significance of the collected data and to understand the implications for corrective action. The components to be evaluated are: the annual plan for special education and related services; identification, screening, and referral; evaluation and classification; individualized education programs; special education programs and related services; program administration; pupil personnel services; staff development, orientation, and training; pupil records; transportation; physical facilities; finance and budget; services to pupils in private schools; and community and interagency relations. A number of checklists are included.

APPENDIX B

ADDITIONAL EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

Introduction

This handbook has presented the basis for a comprehensive evaluation of special education programs. While all the essential aspects of the evaluation process have been covered, some school districts may wish to conduct a more in-depth evaluation. To facilitate this effort, this appendix contains the following sections which should assist in your additional evaluation activities:

1. Additional Goals, Objectives and Evaluation Questions
2. Additional Data Collection Strategies
3. Additional Data Analysis Techniques
4. Goal Free Evaluation
5. Hiring an External Evaluator

Additional Goals, Objectives and Evaluation Questions

Chapter 3 of the handbook contained program goals and objectives; Chapter 4 contained evaluation questions. The goals and objectives were based primarily upon State Board of Education goals. In some cases, program directors may wish to select or develop additional goals which reflect specific local program emphasis.

At the district level, the School Committee or the local advisory committee may have program goals which could be considered. These goals may reflect areas that have not been emphasized in the handbook. Some examples of additional areas could be the following:

1. Vocational Education

2. Severely handicapped students with respect to self-help and disturbing behaviors

3. Content areas other than reading and math (e.g., science and social studies)

4. Quality of specific related services (e.g., speech, transportation, physical therapy, occupational therapy, psychological services and counseling)

Published sets of goals could also be considered. The Center for the Study of Evaluation (CSE) in Los Angeles has published an extremely useful kit for setting educational goals. (Order from: Allyn & Bacon Boston, MA). Included are several cognitive and affective program goals. A local needs assessment for setting goal priorities can be carried out by asking several target groups (administrators, teachers and parents) to sort the goal statements based upon their educational importance.

Phi Delta Kappa (PDK) in Bloomington, Indiana also publishes a list of educational goals for local consideration. Additional suggested sources for published goal statements are the State Education Departments which have documented their state-wide goals.

Once additional local goals have been determined, these goals should be written into specific objectives and evaluation questions. Chapter 2 of the handbook, which contains a discussion of goals, objectives and evaluation questions, should assist you in this effort.

Another aspect of evaluation questions is the matter of criteria. Chapter 4 of the handbook suggests four alternatives for criteria. A potentially useful, but somewhat more burdensome approach would be to obtain baseline criteria levels for regular education programs within the district and compare special and regular education programs.

Careful consideration to the matters of goals, sampling, data collection and analysis must be given before an evaluator can ensure the validity of such comparative evaluation designs.

Additional Data Collection Strategies

The sources of data used in this handbook are not the only possible ways to measure the degree to which the specified program objectives (or other program objectives) are being met. Other sources include interviews, observations, state reports, and IEP or folder analysis beyond that included in this handbook.

Non-standard records also are found to be useful for program evaluation; the burden of extracting and analyzing the data is the issue that must be weighed for any alternative data source. Morris and Fitz-Gibbons (1978) provide examples of non-standard records:

1. Attendance and enrollment logs
2. Progress charts and checklists
3. Certificates of completion of activities
4. Sign-in and sign-out slips
5. Parental permission slips
6. Completed student workbooks
7. Logs, journals, and diaries kept by students, teachers, or aides
8. Unit or end-of-chapter tests
9. Teacher-made tests
10. In-house memos
11. Newspaper articles, news releases
12. Dog-eared and worn textbooks

13. Flyers announcing meetings

14. Circulation files kept on books or other materials

15. Records of bookstore or cafeteria purchases or sales

16. Legal documents such as licenses, insurance policies, rental agreements, leases

17. Diplomas or transcripts

18. Report cards

19. Letters of recommendation

20. Bills, purchasing orders, and invoices from commercial firms providing goods and services

21. Activity or field-trip rosters

22. Student assignment sheets

23. Products produced by students such as drawings, lab reports, poems, themes, and essays

24. Letters to and from parents, business persons, the community

In addition to concerns about data collection and analysis burden, the program evaluator must be concerned about the "disruption" factor when collecting data. Data collection which reduces instructional time should be reconsidered. A parallel concern to the "disruption" factor is the problem that surfaces when the data collection appears to be aimed at evaluating individual staff members, even though program evaluation is the mission. The wrong impression left here can ruin program evaluation data, upset staff, and make future program evaluations more difficult.

Given all of these warnings about additional data collection, one might ask why a special education program evaluator would choose to collect more data. The answers are:

1. To "triangulate" or approach an evaluation question from different sources, thus verifying the conclusion.

2. To provide enough depth to the investigation so that the source or cause of a problem can be identified.

Your charge, then, is to weigh the benefits against the costs when considering future data collection strategies.

Additional Data Analysis Techniques

Chapter 7 of the handbook contained a discussion of using percentages as the primary data analysis statistical technique. This was suggested as a viable way to document the attainment of program objectives.

Some program directors may wish to expand the data anlysis to include comparisons between various subgroups of their total sample. If you wish to test for statistical significance among percentages for the groups, a non-parametric test for differences among proportions would be appropriate. If such difference tests are considered, it is suggested that sample sizes be increased. These tests can be found in most statistics books. The two-group comparison can easily be carried out with a desk calculator; the comparison among more than two groups should be done using a computer program.

Goal Free Evaluation

Goal Based Evaluation is the model used for the body of this handbook because it fits the needs of most special education evaluators. Goal Free Evaluation does have its strengths, so it is briefly described here.

Goal Free Evaluation should be conducted by an "outside" evaluator. As the title implies, the process does not start with the formulation of

goals. Rather, the evaluator impartially observes the program and tries to answer the question "What are the main effects of this program?" After the main effects are hypothesized, the evaluator poses evaluation questions from the hypotheses, designs instruments, and collects data.

It may be that the main effects of a program are quite distinct from the program's stated goals. A positive example of this in a special education evaluation might be the finding that the entire community's attitudes toward handicapped individuals have improved as a result of the program. Likewise, an example of a negative finding might be that the cost of special education generates resentment toward handicapped individuals in the community. Note that this issue would have been addressed in a goal based evaluation only if "community attitudes" was a program goal.

Hiring an External Evaluator

In developing the handbook, the burden to the program director has been kept to a minimum. In some cases, the additional task of program evaluation may necessitate outside assistance. Provided that evaluation funds are available, one may wish to explore the possibility of contracting with an external professional evaluator. This would not only relieve the program director of the task, but also add some impartial credibility to the total evaluation process. The best way to find such an evaluator would be to contact the Department of Education, other school systems, or area universities for their recommendations.

In most cases you will need to develop a Request for Proposals (RFP) which specifies such areas as the nature of your program, evaluation activities requested, responsibilities, time lines, and deliverables. After selecting the evaluator, you will also need to follow local guidelines regarding contracted services.